DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 778 SP 025 772

AUTHOR	McDonald, Frederick J.
TITLE	Study of Induction Programs for Beginning Teachers. Volume I. The Problems of Beginning Teachers: A Crisis in Training.
INSTITUTION	Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	80
CONTRACT	400-78-0069
NOTE	490p.; For related documents, see SP 025 770-775.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF02/PC20 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Beginning Teachers; Higher Education; *Internship Programs; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Development; Program Evaluation; Research Needs; *Teacher Orientation; *Teaching Experience; *Vocational Adjustment
IDENTIFIERS	*Beginning Teacher Induction

ABSTRACT

In this first of four volumes reporting the findings of the study of induction programs for beginning teachers, the problems and issues covered by the study are discussed. A description is given of the methodology used in the study, and a series of recommendations for teacher educators and policymakers are offered. In the first chapter, the human experience of the transition period into teaching is considered. Chapter two provides the history, methods, and major recommendations of the study. Chapter three presents different perspectives on the problems facing the beginning teacher. In the fourth chapter, specific kinds of problems beginning teachers have are described. Approaches to solving the problems of beginning teachers is the topic of chapter five. In chapters six and seven, descriptions are given of selected internship and induction programs. Chapter eight describes and analyses policy problems in dealing with beginning teachers. Chapter nine describes the kinds of research needed to define the nature of the problems of beginning teachers. Recommendations and conclusions are offered in the final chapter. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED257778

STUDY OF INDUCTION PROGRAMS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS

Volume I

The Problems of Beginning Teachers: A Crisis in Training

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Frederick J. McDonald

Project Co-Directors
Frederick J. McDonald
Patricia Elias

SP 025 772

STUDY OF INDUCTION PROGRAMS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS

Volume I

The Problems of Beginning Teachers: A Crisis in Training

Frederick J. McDonald

A project conducted by Educational Testing Service for the National
Institute of Education, Dr. Joseph Vaughn, Project Officer
(Contract No. 400-78-0069)

Project Co-Directors

Frederick J. McDonald

Patricia Elias

Educational Testing Service

Rosedale Road
Princeton, NJ 08541

1947 Center Street
Berkeley, CA 94704

Copyright © 1980. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Preface i

Acknowledgements iii

Chapter 1: THE TRANSITION INTO TEACHING: A HUMAN ENCOUNTER 13

The Study of the Beginning Teacher 14

Chapter 2: THE HISTORY, METHODS AND MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS OF THIS STUDY 17

Background of the Study 18

Changes in the Goals of the Study 20

Methods of Study 26

Analysis and Interpretation 36

Identifiable Facts 40

Unanswered Questions 43

Research and Evaluation 44

Recommendations 45

Chapter 3: THE PROBLEMS OF BEGINNING TEACHERS 49

Different Perspectives on the Needs of Beginning Teachers 52

How Different Perspectives Affect the Education of Beginning Teachers 59

The People Who Enter Teaching and Their Problems as Beginning Teachers 62

Factors Influencing Beginning Teachers' Perceptions of Their Problems 66

Qualitative Changes in Beginning Teachers as They Solve Problems 74

Structural Factors Affecting Beginning Teachers Problems 75

Responsiveness of Beginning Teachers to Ways to Solve Their Problems 76

The Transition Period: Developmental Change, Learning New Skills, or Coping 77

Page

Research on Studying the Influence of Modeling on Learning Teaching Skills 93

Learning From Other Teachers 109

Demonstrations 113

Applications of Social Learning Theory to the Problems of Beginning Teachers 115

To Help Beginning Teachers: Coping Theory or Learning Theory 119

Cognitive Theory and the Problems of Beginning Teachers 120

Conclusion 134

Chapter 4: THE KINDS OF PROBLEMS BEGINNING TEACHERS HAVE 139

The Dynamics of the Problems of Beginning Teachers 140

Notable Features of the Problems of Beginning Teachers 146

A System for Classifying Teachers' Problems 149

Understanding the Problems of Beginning Teachers 156

The Specific Problems of the Beginning Teachers 170

Phase One - The Problems of the First Day of Teaching . . . 178

Phase Two - The First Weeks of School 208

Phase Three - The First Experiences of Evaluating Pupils 212

Acquiring Competence During the First Months of Teaching 218

The Stages of Professional Growth 222

Chapter 5: IDEAS AND APPROACHES TO SOLVING THE PROBLEMS OF BEGINNING TEACHERS 237

The Solution of Preparing Ahead of Time for the Transition Period: Traditional Programs 243

Structure of the Conventional Preservice Program and Preparation for the Transition 246

The Solution of Experiencing the Transition Period While Preparing to Teach: The Internship 254

The Solution of Providing Training During The Period of Initiation: Introduction Programs 260

Page

Chapter 6: THE INTERNSHIP 267
The Internship as a Preservice Program 272
The Intern as School Employee 273
Preparation for the Internship 277
The Nature of the Intern's Practical Experience 281
The Gradual Induction Into the Experience of Beginning to Teach 289
The Supervision of the Intern 295
Demands of the Job of the Intern 300
Influence of Common Attitudes on the Design of Intern Programs 309
The Internship and the Problems of Beginning Teaching . . . 312
The Quality of the Internship Experience 318

Chapter 7: INDUCTION PROGRAMS 327
Preparing Teachers to Teach A Specific Curriculum 331
The Program of the State of Georgia 339
The British Induction Program 344
Conclusion 352

Chapter 8: THE POLICY STUDIES 355
The Policy Issues and Problems 362
The Issues of Authority and Responsibility 367
Orchestrating Political Considerations 382
The Issues of Fiscal Responsibility 388
Policy Issues Related to the Federal Role in the Development of Programs for Beginning Teachers 392

Chapter 9: RESEARCH AND EVALUATION 403
Research on the Problems of Beginning Teachers 404
Descriptive Methodology 414
Strategy for Descriptive Studies 421
Identifying the Causes of the Problems of Beginning Teachers 424
Correlational Analyses of Causes of Beginning Teachers' Problems 440

Page

Creating and Testing Solutions 451

Studies of the Long-Term Professional Development of Teachers 454

Policy Studies 456

Evaluation of Major Program-Types 460

Some Pragmatic Suggestions and Methodological Notes 462

Conclusion 474

Chapter 10: RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS 477

Conclusions 478

Policy Recommendations 480

Research Recommendations 481

References 483

PREFACE

The Study of Induction Programs for Beginning Teachers began as an investigation of fifth-year post-baccalaureate teacher internship programs in which the intern taught half-time while completing an academic program leading to a master's degree. After the start of the study, it became clear that most teacher "intern" programs in the United States did not fit this model. The focus of the study was expanded to an examination of the problems of beginning teachers. The critical questions in this investigation are:

- What are the problems of beginning teachers?
- What kinds of programs have facilitated the solution of these problems?
- What are the consequences of failing to solve these problems in terms of achieving teacher effectiveness and stimulating a career of progressive professional development?

Three approaches were used to gather information on these issues: a review of the relevant literature, the identification of and visits to programs designed to assist beginning teachers, and a review of the evaluation reports of the programs. Twenty-four programs were examined in depth as part of the study. Of these, four were site visits. Educators throughout the nation who are concerned about the problems of beginning teachers were consulted.

The final report of this study consists of four volumes. The first volume discusses the problems and issues covered by the study, describes the methodology utilized in the study, and provides a series of recommendations for teacher ecucators and policy makers. Comprehensive descriptions of exemplary programs for beginning teachers are included in the second volume. The digest of programs is intended to assist educators who either wish to implement or improve induction programs. The third volume provides a review of the literature. The names and locations of educators interested and involved in programs for beginning teachers are provided in the fourth volume.

The project was directed by Project Co-Directors, Dr. Frederick J. McDonald, Senior Research Scientist, Division of Educational Research and Evaluation, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, 08541, and Dr. Patricia Elias, Director of Research and Advisory Services, Educational Testing Service, Berkeley, California, 94704. Information about the study and reports are available from either.

The study was funded by the National Institute of Education (Contract No. 400-78-0069). Dr. Joseph Vaughn, the Project Officer, deserves major credit for exercising the leadership and having the vision to expand the study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project could not have been completed without the assistance and cooperation of many individuals. Carol Stevenson served as the consultant to the project throughout the study. Roni Simon coordinated much of the information collection effort and information management. Mary Lee Fisher prepared a review of the relevant literature. All three participated in the site visits.

An advisory board provided guidance to project staff and helped in reformulating the study. Members of the advisory board inluded: Dr. Jere Brophy, Michigan State University; Dr. Elizabeth Cohen, Stanford University; Dr. Kevin Ryan, Ohio State University; and Dr. Richard Smuck, University of Oregon. We were also assisted by Dr. L. O. Andrews, Emeritus, Ohio State University; Dr. Ray Bolan, University of Bristol, England; and Dr. Jonathan Sandoval, University of California, Davis.

Throughout the project and during the production of the final report, coordination was a key element in the project's success. Alice Norby was the Project Secretary in the Princeton Office. Nancy Castille was the Project Secretary in the Berkeley Office. Other individuals who supported the project co-directors in various aspects of the production of the final report included: 1) Wanda Collins, Jean Gutterman, Bill Theiss, Carlos Velasquez, Monica Laurens, Barbara Sanchez, Robert Allen and Nannette Fox who produced the reports in Berkeley; 2) Ingrid Otten, Michael Walsh, Patricia Wheeler and Alice Setteducati who edited the reports in Berkeley; 3) Helen Tarr, Christine Sansone, and Veronica Morris who coordinated the transmission of materials from Princeton to Berkeley; and 4) Lois Harris who helped type materials in Princeton.

We must acknowledge the support and cooperation of the many educators throughout the nation who provided verbal and written information to us throughout the project. Their unfailing assistance through sometimes several phone calls and their genuine interest in the project were invaluable to us.

And, lastly, we again express our gratitude to the staff and participants of the beginning teacher induction programs who provided us with the opportunity to visit them. The project could not have been done without the time and information they so generously shared with us.

Frederick J. McDonald
Patricia Elias
Project Co-Directors

October 1980
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey and
Berkeley, California

Chapter 1

THE TRANSITION INTO TEACHING:
A HUMAN ENCOUNTER

A new teacher only two months out of college walks into a classroom of high school students in a city far from her college and her home. It is 8:30 a.m. on the first day of school. The teacher has spent the last three days organizing what she is to teach, thinking about purposes and goals, constructing an outline of what she will teach, and making a list of questions, projects, homework assignments and additional readings. The subject is Modern European History 1850 to 1970.

Sitting in front of her are a group of boys and girls, 15 to 16 years old. They are students in a large suburban high school which is one of several high schools serving a county school district. They are in this school for the first time today because the school is a grade 10-12 school. They have come to it from three different junior high schools in different parts of the county. Some communities from which they come are small cities or towns, others are villages set in the midst of farms. The county borders a large metropolitan area and its population has been changing from white middle-class to a mixture of white middle-class and lower middle-class people. The students in the class are racially and ethnically diverse.

As the teacher stands in front of this class she realizes for the first time that she knows nobody in it, has never seen any of these students before, knows nothing about them except the few items of information she has culled from the records sent over from their junior high schools. She does not know the name of one student. She knows the class is "heterogenous" in academic ability and achievement; so she was told by the assistant principal for curriculum. She knows they have had some American History in their junior high schools.

She suddenly realizes that she has not spoken to a fifteen-year-old person since she herself was fifteen years old. How will she introduce herself? How will she get to know the students? What should she say first? What if they don't like her? What if they are uninterested in what she has to teach? Will they cause her trouble? Will the class get out of control? Has she prepared too much? Has she prepared too little?

That large boy in the back of the room looks surly; is he? What are those two girls whispering about? Are they sizing me up? Probably. How do I look to them? Do they think I am an older teacher? Do they know I am just a beginner? What if they know I am a beginner?

Who can I go to if I get into trouble? I have to stick it out this period no matter what happens. When is my free period?

At this moment the teacher faces for the first time the total experience of teaching alone in all of its reality. Four years of preparation have allowed this teacher to stand before this class, but is she ready to teach it? These thoughts may overwhelm her; they probably have consumed many moments of the last few days. Her stomach may be in an uproar. She may not have been able to sleep the night before. She may be fighting panic. Fear certainly is in her mind. In the next hour, the rest of this day, the remainder of the week, and perhaps for many weeks afterwards this teacher will struggle to find herself as a teacher, to set her standards for performance, her own and her students, and will try to see that those standards are adhered to. She will worry about whether she is being too strict or too easy. She will never be quite sure for some time whether she has prepared enough material or too little. She will worry about how she is to evaluate and grade these pupils.

On this day she will take the attendance roster for the first time, but she may not know what to do with the information when she has finished completing the roster, or she may not complete the roster quickly enough and in the meantime the students are becoming restless. What should she do when students are absent? Should she allow them to make up the work? Should she meet with them after school? Should she call home about them?

She is teaching a group of strangers and it will take her many weeks before she begins to know what these students are like, what she can expect of them, what their kidding or shyness, their aggressiveness or withdrawness means. On many days she will be exhausted and emotionally drained. If things do not go well, her anxiety will increase and may verge on panic. There will be times when she will wonder why she has chosen to teach. The first time a student cannot answer a question she will struggle in her mind as how to respond--should she point out that the student ought to have known what he has been asked?

How does she cope with those students who ignore her rules or who act as if they can do as they please? What if she shouts at them? What if she becomes angry? Dare she lose her "cool"?

This is what beginning teaching is like for most teachers. They feel inadequate, unprepared, and unready. Or, they may be overconfident, but are soon disappointed and discouraged. They may think they are ready when in fact they are not--they have prepared too little or too much material for teaching. They cannot cope easily with surprises or events which require them to change their plans.

Are they in this state because they are inept or incompetent? Because they are untrained? Because they lack understanding of what these students may be like? Are they having these feelings because they have lived too isolated a life? Such questions occur readily to anyone who thinks about the problems of beginning teachers.

The Transition Period

For most teachers the initial experiences of teaching are traumatic events out of which they emerge defeated, depressed, constrained, or with a sense of efficacy, confidence and growing sureness in teaching skill. There is no officially accepted name for this early period of teaching which begins on the first day of school and lasts until the teacher has in some sense mastered the basic demands and elemental tasks of teaching. It has most recently been called the induction period, and we are calling it here the transition period. Labeling the period has only one advantage, and that is that it calls attention to an event which is special in character and remarkably distinctive from all that have preceded it.

The study reported here is one of a few studies which have been conducted in recent years on the problems of beginning teachers--this one in the United States, a series of studies in Great Britain and another set in Australia. These studies sought to identify the problems of beginning teachers and to evaluate schemes for helping them with these problems. An expected result of this work is that the critical and focal character of the transition period will be widely recognized, and the policy-makers will energize the means to help teachers with its problems.

Throughout this volume we will make the case that the transition period is a critical event in the life of the teacher. If the teacher can master this phase in teaching, he or she will succeed to some degree as a teacher. Those teachers who cannot master it, who cannot cope with its challenges and its demands, will most assuredly fail as a teachers, even though they may remain in teaching.

Whatever has been said about teaching prior to this initial experience, whatever the teacher has observed as a student or as a trainee will seem inconsequential and weak in a few weeks. One of the most frequent statements of beginning teachers is, "No one told me it was going to be like this". No one could tell them what it was going to be like unless they could give them the experience of beginning teaching.

Could they have been better prepared for it? Are there things that they could have learned about or tried or experienced so that this initial experience was not such a surprise or was not so traumatic or devastating? Many people believe this question has been adequately answered. They believe that the preservice training program has prepared these teachers about as well as they can be prepared, and that the experience of beginning teaching has to be borne as best as it can be. Others believe that preservice training is inadequate, that there are ways in which the beginning teacher can be prepared. They believe that beginning teachers can have experiences very similar to those that they have as they embark fully upon their career as teachers. Others believe that the experience can at best be ameliorated by or attenuated by prior training and experience, but that special help needs to be given to these beginners as they go through the experiences of beginning to teach.

These three points of view have each been applied in one or another program to prepare and to assist teachers. The traditional or most common form of the preservice program has been in existence for a long time; and it is out of this type of program that the great bulk of teachers has come. It is this group of teachers who have, in every study in which they have been queried, told us that the experience of beginning teaching was traumatic and that they did not feel prepared for it.

Others have created various simulations of teaching, and have extended and deepened the experience of practice teaching. The teaching internship program has been created in part to resolve the problems of initial teaching. Only recently have schemes been developed for assisting the teacher during the transition period. Pilot ventures have been tried in Great Britain and some of them seem to be promising.

Each kind of program has produced some teachers who have mastered the transition period and gone on to become highly effective teachers. But in what way has the program helped them become effective? What aspects of training specifically influenced or shaped their capacities for surviving and mastering the transition period? Was their subsequent effectiveness affected more by their training or by what they learned as they moved through the first year of teaching?

Effective Teaching and the Transition Into Teaching

The transition period is obviously a challenge to anyone who has to go through it, and there seems to be no obvious or simple way to avoid that initial experience. The issue, however, is whether or not the teacher in training can be adequately prepared for this initial experience, whatever the form of the program. Does the teacher also need a special kind of support during this period? These questions would be interesting in any circumstances, but we recognize that it is essential to answer them in order to establish the link between the experiences of beginning teaching and a teacher's eventual effectiveness.

It is hardly surprising that teachers in a situation that is anxiety-arousing may not be the most effective problem-solvers or may not proceed in the most rational way. For the beginning teacher surviving is the paramount goal, and the beginning teacher is likely to adopt the practices that help him or her survive. But another effect of this anxiety is that the beginner's concept of surviving will be severely restricted; we will describe evidence that it probably is in most cases.

For the beginner the paramount need is to "keep the class under control". This is not an authoritarian necessity nor is it a desire to have the students completely at the command of the teacher. What most teachers need and expect from students is a sufficient degree of cooperation and involvement so that they can carry on the tasks of instruction as smoothly as possible.

Teachers do differ in what they consider a disruption or an invasion of the authority. But the beginner, because of his or her fears, may have an exaggerated notion of what constitutes an interruption. These disruptions may be magnified by the teacher's insecurity; he or she may see the disruption as a threat or a challenge when in fact it is not intended as such.

The teacher therefore may overreact or use too stringent measures or in the interests of obtaining cooperation and maintaining his or her status with the pupils, may not react appropriately. Any number of inappropriate reactions may occur. If by some chance these reactions help the teacher "maintain control", these practices will be adopted as part of the permanent repertoire of teaching strategies that the teacher characteristically uses. These become his or her survival strategies, and they are frequently referred to in that language by teachers.

When an inexperienced teacher or beginner asks an experienced teacher for help in such matters, the experienced teacher is likely to describe those techniques which he or she used in those early days to "bring a class under control". These survival mechanisms then become part of a folklore and a tradition of management and instruction. They may or may not be effective for the purposes of managing many different kinds of classes. They may or may not increase the instructional effectiveness of the teacher. They may or may not improve the quality of the teacher's relations with pupils. Some do and some do not achieve these goals.

But the beginning teachers may not be thinking in an entirely rational and clear-headed way. They need to know what is going to work, and will try whatever is suggested to them, or they will continue to use whatever they hit upon that seems to work. In these ways the transition period may be the critical period for determining the eventual instructional effectiveness of the teacher.

The Shaping of a Teacher During the Transition

We are not implying that the transition period is so traumatic and so demanding that whatever a teacher learns to use at this time is unchangeable; that there is no hope of future development or likelihood of progress beyond this immediate coping with problems. Unfortunately, as we will frequently point out, we have very little information on the history of the development of the teacher from these beginning days of teaching, but we are reasonably certain that a substantial number of teachers are shaped by the experiences of the transition period and that some number of them never change from that point on.

It is a truism among teachers and especially teacher educators that within the first six months of the first experience of teaching the teacher will have adopted his or her basic teaching style. Experience indicates that once a teacher's basic teaching style has stabilized, it remains in that form until some other event causes a change, and at the present time there are not many such events producing change. If the style adopted is a highly effective one and is the source of stimulation to continuous growth, there would be no problem. But if teachers abandon their ideals and become cynical, see management at any price as essential, constrict the range of instructional alternatives they will try or use; if they become mediocre teachers or minimally competent, then the effect of the transition period on them is a major concern and a problem which needs direct attention.

It seems to be true that the transition period is the major shaping event in the professional life of the teacher. Although many people have recognized the importance of this period, it has not been the focal point of most training, either in preservice or inservice.

The Neglect of the Transition Period

The transition period or induction period into teaching at the present time is no one's responsibility except the individual teacher. School systems do have orientation programs but they are primarily devices for giving information about personnel and curriculum matters; they are brief in character; they are not attuned to the needs of individual teachers. The supervisory systems in schools serve no real function in this respect as far as anyone can detect, and they have the particular liability of being linked to the evaluation of the teacher.

Most training programs in the colleges and universities believe that they are preparing teachers for beginning teaching, but their view is that beginning teaching ought to be the most professional kind of teaching that is possible. This is not to imply that the teacher educators are insensitive to or unaware of the problems of beginning teachers, but they are oriented to the long-term development of the teacher and to the achievement of the highest level of professional competence.

The beginning teacher's problems are much more mundane. The beginning teacher has to be able to manage a class on the first day, conduct basic instruction, organize sufficient material to carry the instruction over several days, organize it in an orderly structure over time, and begin the process of evaluating pupils and communicating the results of those evaluations to the pupils and their parents.

Failure to establish sufficient authority to conduct instruction leads to disaster sooner or later. Poor organization of material leads to incomplete lessons or serious omissions in the curriculum and may have an effect on discipline and management. Evaluation is necessary to grade and the teacher has to be able to explain how he or she is grading to the pupils and to their parents in a way that does not create an uproar among the students or their parents.

One may know quite a bit about the subject matter about to be taught, but may not know it at the level that it is presented in the high school. [illegible] one may have majored in European History but is assigned classes in Ancient History. Or one may be skillful in teaching reading, but be terrified of teaching mathematics even though the teacher may have passed the college's requirements in mathematics. Any number of courses may have discussed relations with pupils but the teacher is facing a particular group of students with which he or she may have had little or no experience.

It is this mundane world of the immediate classroom that is the essence and almost the totality of the beginning teacher's experience for several months. If this experience has paramount influence on how the teacher develops, what their concept of effectiveness becomes, how they see the world of teaching, then it ought to be treated as the event around which training and assistance is built. It is not unreasonable to claim that the criteria which should be applied to evaluate teacher training programs ought to be drawn from an analysis of the experiences of beginning teachers. It is not too strong a proposal to urge that mastering this period in a way that insures continuous professional development and progressive achievement of competence and efficacy ought to be the criteria by which teacher training programs are judged. It is not sufficient to say that some people may become highly professional teachers as a result of a teacher training programs two years, five years or ten years hence if the majority of their graduates are becoming minimally effective, are restricting their views of what constitutes competence, and have an attenuated sense of efficacy because of the initial experiences of teaching.

The Transition Period and the Teacher's Sense of Efficacy

We are only beginning to study in any depth and breadth the teacher's sense of efficacy and competency. But we suggest here that the transition period will markedly affect this sense of efficacy. We have been describing a life event which is challenging, and like all such events, how one comes out of it determines how efficacious one feels in coping with the substance of such experiences. It is difficult to see how one could go through the first year of teaching barely managing from day-to-day and walk away from that experience with a sense of accomplishment or of efficacy.

If, therefore, we expect teachers to develop that feeling of sureness in judgment, confidence in their own powers to teach, and a sense of being on top of most teaching situations, then we have to insure that the transition period is one that they are likely to survive with grace and growing effectiveness.

THE STUDY OF THE BEGINNING TEACHER

We will develop the proposition in the following chapters that the study of the beginning teacher is a study of critical events in the development of any teacher. We believe that such studies will cast light upon the processes of development as they occur and the factors that influence continuing and future development.

This kind of study is essential if we are to begin to understand how teachers become more professional and more competent. Although the study of the teacher in training and the experienced teacher are important, the study of the transitional phase or the induction phase may be the key to understanding, for example, why so many experienced teachers are resistant to stimulations to professional development and why some forms of training have such limited effects on competence and a sense of efficacy.

We believe that the seeds of "burn-out" are planted during this period. We think that some of the resistance to inservice activities, to curriculum development activities, to other efforts to improve the complexity and level of teaching are born out of the experience of having survived the transitional period--essentially alone. We think that intensive study of this period would support this assertion, and we will at many places point out the paucity of knowledge and urge greater and more intense study of the beginning teacher.

THIS STUDY

This study takes the problems of beginning teachers as its focal point. It asks: what are these problems and what can be done to relieve beginning teachers of them, to prevent their occurrence, or to ameliorate them if in some sense they are inevitable.

We spend considerable time in analyzing why these problems probably occur, why training programs have not necessarily prevented their occurrence and why they have not been obviated by various other arrangements.

But we think the most important outcome of this study might well be to call attention to the critical nature of the transition period into teaching. If this period has influence on teaching effectiveness and on teachers' sense of efficacy and competence, and if their feelings of satisfaction and professionalism in teaching are strongly influenced by the experiences of the transition period, then the quality of these experiences will set limits on the effectiveness they will achieve. We will have insured that some teachers will be failures or minimally competent or largely ineffective; we will have put dampers on their growth beyond what they learn from the first six months of teaching.

If these statements seem particularly strong, we will suggest in the following chapters that they are the reasonable conclusions from what teachers themselves have told us about their initial experiences. Researchers and educators may want greater validation of what these experiences are like, and we believe that such studies would be useful, but we suspect that they will only strengthen the point of view expressed here. Our view is that it is more important to understand why this experience has its present character, and to find ways to change the nature of that experience.

Chapter 2

THE HISTORY, METHODS AND MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS OF THIS STUDY

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

This study was originally designed to be a study of teaching internship programs in the United States. The Request for a Proposal from the National Institute of Education defined the internship as a fifth-year post-baccalaureate program during which the intern had at least a half-time teaching-load and also completed an academic program leading to a Master's degree. The study was to use three methods of inquiry: 1) to collect, cull, analyze and summarize the research literature on teaching internships; 2) to describe existing intern programs; and, 3) to make site visits to representative programs. The goal of the inquiry was to describe what is now known about the internship programs in many different categories such as how the programs are designed, how they are administered and what they cost. Information on the evaluation of intern programs was also to be collected, analyzed and summarized. Proposals for model programs and evaluation designs were to be offered.

An analysis was to be made of the conceptual bases of internships. This analysis, together with the factual data about the design and operation of intern programs when analyzed in the light of the evaluation literature, would yield a description of what we currently know about the teaching internship, what research needs to be done, and what proposals could be made for its more general adoption or improvement.

Interest in the Study

There appeared to be widespread interest in the results which this study might produce. A number of prominent educators told us how important it was and offered their assistance. We have profited from these offers of help, and have found any number of professionals in teaching who have been willing to make suggestions, point us in the direction of information or programs, and who were willing to discuss issues with us.

The internship is a form of teacher training which attracts attention, support and criticism. It has recently become the focus of political activity, most notably in New York State, where a task force has proposed that the internship become a basic component in teacher training. Other states have moved to develop a probationary period for beginning teachers. In discussions of such a probationary period, the internship is almost invariably considered as one way of organizing it. For example, the discussions of the Newman Commission in New Jersey have included the review of a proposal to require an internship as part of such a probationary period, though this proposal was not adopted.

Issues the Study was Designed to Address

The political issues surrounding the internship, whether as a part of teacher training or probation, were not to be the object of study in this project. Only incidentally or indirectly were such issues to be addressed. Rather, it was believed that the analysis of the evaluation literature would provide substantial data about the practical value of the internship programs. Such information might lead to recommendations for improving internships (conceivably recommendations could be made to abandon the internship). It was believed that if there were a solid base of knowledge, conclusions could be drawn about what directions to take in the development of intern programs.

The decision to make the internship a major or critical component of a teacher education structure is a policy decision which inevitably is influenced by many different kinds of political considerations. Many individuals who are interested in the internship approach to teacher preparation may be looking at this study for support of the institutionalization of this way of training teachers.

But our task was not to do the kind of study which would either recommend or not recommend such a major policy decision. Our task was confined to producing data relevant to some aspects of that policy decision and to policy decisions about research which the National Institute of Education might choose to make or consider as it plans staff development programs.

CHANGES IN THE GOALS OF THE STUDY

It became apparent as we read the literature and began our survey of existing intern programs that there were many interesting programs called intern programs which did not fit the definition we were using. We quickly had to sort out those programs for which the label "internship" was a euphemism for student teaching or practice teaching. But a more serious problem arose when we read the literature of an earlier period in which proposals for the internship were generated.

The major thrust of early proposals for intern programs was to recommend a period of preservice training capped with a year of internship. The internship was seen as the culmination of training prepared for by a progressive program of observation, practicum experiences in the schools, and student or practice teaching. For example, in one major proposal developed by what is now the Association for Teacher Educators, sequential levels of teaching experience were defined: assistant teacher, associate teacher, and finally, intern.

Variations on this recommendation were made because of the practical difficulties in establishing a program that would require at least five years to complete. One form of recommended change was to move the internship into the last year of the undergraduate program. However, because a full year usually cannot be used for that purpose, the time was reduced to one semester of internship. But the structure and sequence of the variations were essentially the same as that recommended in the basic proposals.

Even though these ideas were accepted as the model to be followed, we could find no programs still in existence that followed this model and we could find very few in the historical record. It may be that historical reports are incomplete. However, we do know of one program, the Stanford Elementary Program, which successfully implemented this model for many years and was discontinued for reasons irrelevant to the quality or success of the program. One of its problems was that it was a five-year program, and the investment of time, money and effort required to complete such a program could not be made by some students who in many instances were able to enter teaching without completing the fifth year of internship. This may be the reason why the ideal form or model of an internship has not become widely institutionalized.

We decided to find as much information as we could about all programs that seemed to involve a "genuine" internship, meaning by genuine a program in which the intern assumes full responsibility for teaching for a sustained period of time. We thought that we could use information on these varied programs to develop contrasts with the traditional program, the fifth-year post-baccalaureate program. Our investigations immersed us in the literature of teacher education and gave us perspectives on the general problems of educating teachers.

Influence of the British Experience with Programs for Beginning Teachers

As this study got under way information became available about the British experience with programs for beginning teachers conducted at the local school and district level. These programs differed from internships in that the beginning teacher had completed a preservice program and was on the job. The goal of the programs was to help beginning teachers expand their effectiveness and to master the transition or induction period into teaching. Research conducted on these programs was in print and the director of the research was on an extended visit to the United States during which he described this work to various groups.

The British experiments generated considerable interest among educators in this country. We had some discussions with Dr. Ray Bolam, the director of the original evaluation of the projects and a member of the research unit of the Teacher Induction Pilot Scheme at the University of Bristol in England. Our discussions focussed on the delineation of the critical problems of the beginning teacher and the more general concept of a "beginning teacher". We had been assuming that interns were, for all practical purposes, beginning teachers because they carried full responsibility for the conduct of instruction in the classes to which they were assigned. Dr. Bolam, however, argued persuasively that status characteristics were highly relevant to the definition of the role of the beginning teacher. Some status characteristics create a kind of psychology of role involvement which is directly related to the kinds of problems which the beginner is likely to have.

The essence of Dr. Bolam's argument was that the intern is a temporary member of the school staff, certainly in the legal sense, and probably in the sociological sense, and may in fact not return to the school in which he or she is interning. Dr. Bolam's point was that this temporary status created a psychological milieu in which the interns could make decisions or take actions for which they did not have to worry about the longer term consequences. Thus in some degree, their involvement in the school is attenuated and the character of their experience accordingly is shaped by this attenuation.

Obviously, this is a moot point that could be resolved rather straightforwardly by direct comparisons of interns and first-year beginning teachers. But, this discussion served to heighten an issue which we had been considering, particularly as we read about different kinds of programs: what are the focal problems with which an internship program is concerned and which it presumably could solve better than traditional programs? This problem also interested our project officer, and at the meeting of our Advisory Committee we discussed at great length a change in the focus of the project which would broaden its scope.

We agreed at this meeting to enlarge the scope of our project to include a study of programs designed to assist the beginning teacher. Practically, this change meant that we had to expand our review of the literature and find sites in the United States where induction programs for beginning teachers were in place. Although this revision cost us considerable time and at least doubled the amount of work, we viewed the change as very desirable.

The consequence is that this study is an examination of the problems of beginning teachers and the programs which have been designed to assist them with these problems. The teaching internship is and has been viewed historically as a means of inducting people directly into the teaching profession. It is a form of direct immersion in teaching in which the intern apparently experiences, with supervision, most of the problems of beginning teachers but for which the intern has not necessarily had the long period of preservice education and training of other beginning teachers. Interns differ from the beginning teachers in programs like the British programs where the beginners have had preservice experience and are full-time employees of, but probationary teachers in, a school.

Our methods of research and analysis were to remain essentially the same -- review of existing literature, identification of and visits to existing programs, and a review of evaluation reports on programs. We had to add, however, a major area of study, namely the literature on the problems of beginning teachers. These changes in direction and focus took place over a period of six months or so. The results of our original work plus these extensions and expansions of it are presented in this report.

The report, therefore, reflects our study of the problems of beginning teachers, what we know about these problems, the kinds of programs that exist, how these programs have been evaluated and what the results of these evaluations have been. The report concludes with an overall analysis and interpretation of these data, suggestions for research and development, and recommendations for the kinds of programs and policies which might be developed to help beginning teachers master the transition into teaching.

The Transition into Teaching

The consequence of these changes in our investigation is that we have made the transition period or induction period into teaching the focal point in an analysis of the structure of teacher education. We see, programs as ways of mediating and facilitating this transition or induction period for beginning teachers.

Even on the basis of the available literature, a convincing case can be made that the transition period into teaching is the critical period in the development of a teacher. We do not propose this as an invariant or as one that has been absolutely demonstrated, but we take the point of view that what precedes the transition period is the early stage of a developmental process which is critically affected by the transition period. We also think that what follows in the development of a teacher is shaped or determined by what happens to the teacher during the transition period.

We regard the transition period as a major and critical life experience for teachers. All individuals who move into new social roles go through a period of transition or induction which may be stressful. But teaching has certain unique features which places particular kinds of strains on individuals.

Obviously, an individual who is ill prepared for teaching will find the transition period far more difficult than it would be if he or she were better prepared. However, it appears that almost all teachers, regardless of the quality or quantity of their preparation, experience trauma at this point in their lives. How they cope with this trauma determines what they use of their preservice training and shapes their future professional development.

This idea, if it is substantiated by additional research, and we believe that it should be tested more comprehensively than it has been, is a focal point for our analysis and our investigation. More importantly, if both this central idea and the results which we have organized around it withstand further empirical testing, the implication is clearly that the transition period must be used as the criterion situation for which the teacher is prepared. Practically it means that mastering this transition ought to be the major goal of teacher education from the undergraduate program through at least the first year of teaching.

We have organized the results of the investigation, therefore, around the problems of the beginning teacher, and we have analyzed the teaching internship, the British pilot schemes and their American equivalents as effective programs for helping teachers with the problems of the transition into teaching. The critical questions in this investigation are:

1. What are the problems of beginning teachers?
2. What kinds of programs have facilitated the solution of these problems?
3. What are the consequences of failing to solve these problems in terms of achieving teaching effectiveness and stimulating a career of progressive professional development?

METHODS OF STUDY

This study in both its original and expanded conceptualization was intended to be essentially reflective in nature, a study in which the staff considered the issues and ideas that emerged from literature, discussions with interested educators, and--in particular--interviews and discussions with teacher trainees in districts and institutions of higher education.

The project was not intended to be an all-inclusive survey of extant programs and practices. We were, rather, to select and describe fully a small number of programs attempting to assist beginning teachers. We originally proposed a more extensive survey to augment the basic information base. That, however, was not feasible as the focus of the project changed.

The survey instruments were completed by the staff and participants of the programs where site visits were conducted prior to those visits. We used that information to augment our general guidelines for interviews with specific questions suggested by the survey results.

Analysis of the Research Literature

The research literature is described in detail in a separate volume, as are the methods used for its collection and organization. We used the usual procedures for identifying relevant literature. Computer assisted searches of the available indices of literature were made, and the initial searches were brought up-to-date by a hand search of relevant indices and abstracts. Materials for inclusion also were suggested by our advisory committee and by many of the educators we contacted during the study.

After the initial title search, abstracts were reviewed, relevant articles, books or documents were ordered, and, finally, reviewed by the staff. A system for exchanging documents among staff members was established.

After the project's goals and scope were changed, the search for additional literature was conducted. The new literature was integrated into the previous collection. The results of the entire literature review appear in the third volume of the project report.

The staff discussed the substance of the literature on numerous occasions both in formal meetings and informally in conversations. This discussion was facilitated by the remarkably homogeneous character of the literature--the literature is more rhetorical than it is descriptive. Not much of it presents empirical data or analyses of data. There are a number of reports which represent solid proposals for the development of different types of programs and these proposals were used as frames of reference for thinking about possible kinds of teaching internships or beginning teacher programs.

There is very little in the way of detailed descriptions of programs. The historical record of induction programs is relatively weak. It is difficult to know what was done, how changes were made over the years or what the major results of the use of these programs were. But there is sometimes enough information to have at least a general idea of what the program was like such that the character of the claims for its achievements can be categorized and examined.

The literature on the problems of beginning teachers is fairly extensive, but is largely impressionistic or dissertation-type research. The literature, both descriptive and empirical, left much to be desired for the purposes of this study.

The Identification of Programs for Beginning Teachers

Besides the literature review, telephone and mail surveys were used to locate structured programs designed to assist beginning teachers. We surveyed, by telephone, the directors of national and regional associations and organizations involved directly and indirectly in teacher training and inservice activities. We talked to the officers in state departments of education responsible for teacher certification, education or inservice training in their states.

We provided our definition of a beginning teacher and the kinds of programs we wished to locate:

teacher and the kinds of programs we wished to locate:

> "A person in the first year of teaching where some kind of systematic program is in place to help the teacher. The programs may be local, regional, etc., and may or may not involve an institution of higher education. The beginning teacher must be certificated, provisionally or fully; paid by the district, and working full time or on a somewhat reduced work load."

We indicated that we had found beginning teachers were sometimes called interns or residents. Our respondents were asked not only to identify programs but to nominate those they considered "exemplary." We widened our information network by also asking each person to help us locate other people who were interested or involved in such programs.

Some 500 inquiries about the existence of program were mailed to people and institutions throughout the nation. Every state superintendent was included in the mailing as were all institutions with graduate level education departments with a fairly sizeable enrollment. The total search effort produced a list of about fifty programs.

The directors of the fifty programs were contacted by phone. About twenty-four of those actually fit our definitions and were regarded as exemplary by educators not connected with the programs. A more detailed interview was prepared and sent to the program directors in advance of a second phone call. Our goal now was to describe the twenty-four programs.

As part of the interview process, we requested that relevant printed information be sent to us, and asked if we might call back to fill in any additional information needed. We also indicated that we planned to visit a small number of programs and asked if the program director to whom we were talking would be amenable to such a visit. The report of the interviews and site visits appears in Volume Two, The Digest of Programs.

Identification of Prototypes for Site Visits

The project co-directors considered several dimensions for the final selection of programs we would look at in considerable depth. The programs were all nominated as "exemplary," the best of their kind. There was a remarkable concurrence in these nominations.

We selected programs that were stable, had evolved over time, were distinctive in one or more respects and were representative of a type of program.

The major characteristic required of all identified prototypes was a demonstrated history of viability. We picked programs to visit that had been in existence for a number of years and had thus demonstrated a certain viability. They obviously had been accepted by institutions and communities in which they functioned. They had presumably survived various kinds of crises, and they may have adapted over time to challenges and crises in a way that would be interesting to study and informative for those who would need to know about such problems.

We also tried to vary the programs by characteristics of the sponsoring institution, geographic location, and the kinds of schools and student populations with which they worked. One of the major goals of the original research was to identify programs designed to train teachers for specific contexts, such as inner-city schools, or for specific pupil populations, such as special education students. Other major characteristics considered were whether the program had a conceptual basis (and subsequently, its conception of the problems of beginning teachers), the level of schooling for which teachers were being prepared, the degree or certificate to be obtained, the program's distinctive features, and the designs and methods used for evaluation. Variation could not be found on all of these characteristics. There was little variation, for example, in the evaluation of programs. Evaluation, in general, is confined to surveys of participants and staff.

The same dimensions were considered in the selection of district-sponsored programs for beginning teachers as were used to select programs associated with institutions of higher education. Here, however, our choice was much simpler. We found only five structured and sustained programs for beginning teachers sponsored by school districts in the nation. Assuming that we and the various people whom we consulted may have missed some, the number of such programs is still very small.

Two of what appeared to be very interesting district programs were just beginning, and therefore were not appropriate for site visits. They are, however, included among the descriptions of district-based programs in the Digest of Programs, Volume Two of this series of reports.

We selected four programs as case study sites. Three are associated with institutions of higher education and one is a district-based program. They are:

1. The University of Oregon Program for Resident Teachers is a one-year program for certificated elementary school teachers. The teachers are employed as full-time teachers in urban, suburban and rural school districts.
2. The Temple Intern Program for College Graduates is a two-year program for college graduate with little or no background in education, but with a strong academic background in a content area, content areas for which there is a demand for teachers,

i.e., mathematics and science. The Temple interns are full-time high school teachers in inner-city and suburban schools.

3. The Stanford Intern Program is a relatively small one-year program for college graduates who may or may not have had a background in education. They are not certificated teachers. Stanford interns are employed one-half time as high school teachers of English, social studies, physical education and music in urban and suburban schools.

4. The Jefferson County, Colorado, district-based program is a one-year program for certificated teachers at the elementary, junior high, and high school levels. The teachers are full-time teachers in suburban communities near Denver.

The Purposes and Utility of the Site Visits

The purpose of the site visits was to have a face-to-face meeting with the people who had developed the programs, who were or had participated in them, and to observe first-hand whatever activities we could. In our visit to Temple University, for example, we spent time talking with the director of the program who organized the list of people and events that we should see. We met with faculty members who participated in the program. We talked with graduates of the program and current participants in it. We spoke to a member of the Philadelphia school system who worked with Temple University to place candidates and who was in charge of personnel matters related to their employment. We observed classes at the University. In most places we had no real opportunities, however, to observe interns or beginning teachers teaching. We examined documents, particularly if there were any evaluation information available (of which there was a paucity).

These visits gave us an opportunity to learn about the programs in detail, and equally importantly, to explore the thinking and experience of those individuals who had been associated with the program for long periods of time. These individuals could tell us about the politics of the development and the long-term sustenance of the program. They were remarkably frank about difficulties and appropriately modest about achievements, but not so modest that we were likely to miss these achievements. We explored with them their philosophy of teacher training. We discussed the intra-institutional arrangements for the program, how many faculty members believed in the concept of the program and were willing to participate in it, whether the administration saw the program as useful, how many students it attracted compared to other programs, what internal support it received for its operations.

Each site visit was an opportunity to discuss a variety of issues and problems in teacher education. Each person with whom we spoke provided us with his or her ideas on issues and problems in both preservice and inservice programs. We were thus able to relate the details of the program to the kinds of thinking which various people were bringing to bear on the problems of assisting beginning teachers. We were able to obtain insight into why various features of the program had been developed, were modified, or were discontinued. We also noted any constraints under which the program necessarily functioned.

We had the opportunity to cross-validate information which we were receiving by talking to different people. Since much of what we "observed" consisted of statements on papers or words in a conversation, we had no way of knowing whether what we were being told was a completely honest or accurate description. The only reason we had to believe that we might not be getting completely honest or accurate pictures was that it was in the interest of individuals to describe their programs in the best possible light. We thought this might lead to omissions rather than to exaggerations, but we could not detect any obvious omissions in what was being said. The respondents were remarkably courteous when we questioned them and patient as we went into detail on matters with which they were exhaustively familiar.

But as we spoke to different individuals, especially individuals in different roles such as faculty members and beginning teachers, we were able to check details on how the program functioned. We obviously obtained a fairly accurate picture of attitudes, though it would not be an unreasonable suspicion that we might not have been exposed to individuals who had negative attitudes towards the program. We did ask about such individuals, and knowledgeable persons admitted to their existence when they did exist, but they seemed to be relatively few in number.

In any school of education faculty members tend to be interested primarily in their own programs and only marginally interested in other programs unless the latter impinge on their own programs in some way. It is not surprising, therefore, that an intern program, for example, is surrounded by individuals who believe in what the program is doing and are totally committed to it. These are the people one meets when an intern program is visited. Other individuals have secondary interests in the program and the majority of faculty members may be largely uninformed about how the program functions. It is not unlikely, therefore, that the opponents of such programs would be few in number. Moreover, programs which have lasted many years may have outlined opponents or wearied them into grudging acceptance.

We are not implying that the views of individuals who do not like intern programs or are opposed to them can be simply dismissed. Their attitudes are negative and sometimes hostile towards the intern program but underlying these attitudes is a point of view about teacher training which is representative of the point of view held by many teacher educators. This point of view largely rests on the assumption that the induction into teaching should be gradual and should be preceded by the learning of substantial amounts of theory. This view is certainly respectable and time-honored.

We make these points because we did not survey the attitudes of every person associated with the programs we visited. Our point is that we do not think that such surveys are necessary unless one is interested in the general attitudes of individuals toward specific programs. The critical questions are: are there individuals who believe sufficiently in the program to sustain it; is there a sufficient body of positive attitudes or a power base so that the program is not under continual attack or threat of being terminated?

Our concern, therefore, with the individuals with whom we spoke is not whether they expressed attitudes representative of the entire staff, but whether they represented the attitudes of individuals who were primarily concerned with the program. We were also concerned about whether the programs had a strong institutional base, though we were safe in assuming that they did because the programs which we visited had been in existence for a considerable period of time.

We have spent these several pages discussing the validity and reliability of our information because we relied heavily on it. It was important in the first place to obtain accurate information on how the program functioned; second, to ascertain wherever possible the kinds of problems which the program may have had; and third, to place the program and its functioning in the context of a larger picture of the problems of teacher education and of education more generally.

It was important, for example, to find out how the faculty members at Temple thought about the problems of teaching in inner-city schools, and how they saw their program preparing teachers for these problems. The answer is illustrative of the point we are making. They had built a summer experience in an inner-city school which gave entering interns direct experience with the kinds of pupils they would be teaching. But they also had a larger vision of what this experience ought to do for each beginning teacher. They placed interns who were themselves from the inner-city in a suburban school, and interns from suburban areas in an inner-city school to enlarge the perspective of each on the broader problems of education. The direct evidence that this system worked was provided by the interns' description of the effects of the program on them.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

It is a fact of life, apparently, that program designers and developers are busy implementing their programs and less concerned about writing about them. Therefore, our phone interviews and visits to existing programs yielded more information on the details of programs than did the research literature.

The important aspect of our data-gathering, however, was the "feel" we got for programs by visiting some of them. Our problem was to protect ourselves from positive or negative biases about such programs. We therefore worked as independently as possible during the various stages of data-gathering and we exchanged notes and ideas at subsequent stages. As we continued the site visit interviews, for example, we frequently interviewed in pairs taking separate and independent notes.

After we had gathered a body of data either in the literature or from our surveys or site visits, we cross-questioned each other about the information and about the interpretation of this information. Most of what appears in this volume is a product of thinking and talking with each other and with other people about the problems of beginning teachers, about internships and residencies, and about programs for beginning teachers conducted in school districts. But the organization of ideas which resulted did not occur in a haphazard fashion.

We began by organizing the basic descriptive data about a program or a program type, and used this information as a control on our interpretation. Obviously not every idea about programs could be checked by a specific fact in our field notes or in the research literature; in fact, one of our tasks was to look beyond these rather limited sources of data and to seek understandings and interpretations which were consistent with the facts or about which more information would be needed before the interpretation could be accepted with any sense of ultimate conviction or finality. We talked, we proposed, we cross-checked, we sought out people who knew more than we did or whose ideas we thought would be particularly valuable. Out of that amalgam of analysis, interpretation and constant questioning we arrived at the interpretations of the problems of beginning teachers and of the values of certain programs for helping them which appear in this report.

An example will illustrate how we worked. Several months ago five of us sat down to discuss the problems of beginning teachers. In this group were the co-directors, one of whom had spent a number of years teaching in the Stanford intern program; and the other director had worked with an intern program at the University of California at Berkeley for several years. Our principal collaborator had been a Teacher Specialist in Montgomery County, had worked with beginning teachers, and had also worked in the innovative teacher training program at the University of Maryland. Our two project research assistants, both of whom were experienced teachers, were the remaining members of this discussion group.

We spent the better part of two weeks going through the descriptions of the problems of beginning teachers as they appeared in the literature and organizing these descriptions into the phases which are described later in this volume. But the way we worked on this strategy is illustrative.

We usually began by asking the teachers present what their problems were as they began to teach. We then checked their descriptions against information which was in the literature. Our principal collaborator, for example, could corroborate from the perspective of a Teacher Specialist working with teachers what was reported either by our research assistants or in the literature. If the literature seemed to be relatively weak on an aspect of these problems, it was supplemented by these three experienced practitioners. We intercorrelated and related the experiences of the individuals present and built them into a framework, and then validated this framework against what seemed to appear in the literature.

The value of this particular approach was that it added what was missing from the literature. Most of the studies in the literature about the problems of beginning teachers are not sequenced in terms of their time of occurrence. They are general descriptive statements of what these problems were. They are also usually context-free, and one has little sense of what some of these descriptions really mean. But these descriptions take on real meaning when interpreted by an experienced practitioner who "knows" what the teachers are reporting (if it has not been too abstracted by the investigator who reported the data).

In a similar way we compared notes about internship programs. The director who had the longest experience in an internship program would present problems which he had observed or encountered in this model, and these problems in turn were discussed by the members of the staff who had interviewed and studied other programs. The experience with the different types of training programs among the senior staff made it possible to do a variety of cross-comparisons of what was occurring in each program and to be alert to omissions from programs of features that were present in another program.

These ways of proceeding were the strategies of all of our analyses and interpretations. Eventually we reached a point where we committed to paper the basic ideas which had been tested by these interactions on the substance of what we read, observed, and what we had experienced.

We do not pretend that our interpretations are unique because each of us has been influenced by significant individuals over the years as we worked in these various programs or as we talked to people in the course of our visits and phone calls. We have not hesitated, however, to "go beyond the data". We do not pretend that everything we say here is indisputably substantiated by an item of fact or an observation. As the reader will see, we have interpreted, but not randomly nor do we believe wildly, and we have been careful to point to alternative interpretations.

We have proceeded in the spirit of inquiry. What we have observed has suggested interpretations to us which we have presented, has raised questions in our minds which we have presented, and wherever possible we have educed the kinds of evidence which is currently available on the matter in question. We offer these analyses and interpretations therefore for debate and discussion which will lead to the kinds of formal policy and research studies which are badly needed in this aspect of teacher education.

What may be most difficult for some readers to accept is our emphasis on the transition or induction period as the critical stage in the development of a teacher. We do not claim that we can prove this point; it is rather a theoretical or hypothetical interpretation of what the literature seems to be telling us about the development of teachers. It is buttressed by our own observations of teachers (and as a group we have worked with a substantial number of beginning teachers). Whether our biases shaped our recollection of our observations or whether our observation shaped our interpretations may be a matter of dispute in the abstract; but in reality we think that the interpretation that we arrived at was seeded in some way in the elements of our experience and refined as we analyzed the work we had done on this project.

IDENTIFIABLE FACTS

There are some facts which have emerged out of this investigation which are either indisputable or would, we think, withstand more careful and methodologically sound study. We present here the major facts.

1. Almost all teachers experience the transition period into teaching as the most difficult aspect of their teaching life and career. There apparently are some teachers who move into teaching smoothly and efficiently, but the majority report the period is one of great difficulty and even trauma.

2. The major kinds of problems and difficulties that teachers experience are readily identifiable. Most of them relate to the management and conduct of instruction. These problems are so critical that it is easy to overlook the equally obvious fact that the range of problems includes difficulties with evaluating pupils, being evaluated by the administration, working with parents, developing a consistent teaching style, finding out how the school functions, knowing the rules that must be followed, and a variety of other problems.

3. The least studied aspect of this transition period is the fear, anxiety, and feelings of isolation and loneliness which appear to characterize it. There is sufficient information in existing reports to indicate that these feelings are not uncommon, however, individual conversations with teachers are far more revealing than the current literature.

4. Almost all teachers report that they went through this transition period "on their own". They had little or no help available, and found help only through their own initiative. This help usually took the form of seeking out some other teacher in whom they could confide.

5. Beginning teachers appear to go through a series of stages which are developmental in nature. The classroom concerns of the beginning teacher, for example, first seem to revolve around general control, establishing and maintaining discipline of the whole class, and organizing and pacing instructional material. When this problem has been "solved," in the psychological sense, the teachers are free to begin to look at their students in more differentiated ways. They begin to think about their pupils as individuals who have certain characteristics that they might take into account in designing the instructional system or program. When a teacher is relatively comfortable with thinking about pupils in terms of their individual characteristics, he or she is then "free" to focus more on the design and implementation of instructional programs. If this is, as we hypothesize, a developmental sequence, teachers who do not solve a problem at one level are not likely to move on to another level. At each stage or phase the teacher is immersed in a different set of problems. Problems that are not solved at one stage usually create enduring effects that affect subsequent stages. In some cases teachers never move beyond the problems they confronted in the earliest stages. The

consequences are that the beginning teacher may fail as a teacher; or may severely restrict the range of teaching activities in which he or she is willing to engage and in which he or she is effective and competent.

6. There is probably a strong relationship between how the teacher passes through the transition period and how likely they are to progress professionally to higher levels of competence and endeavor.

7. Existing preparation programs do not seem to prepare teachers adequately for this initial period, though programs for beginning teachers place teachers in a situation where they can be supervised more carefully while they are going through the transition period. But no preservice or inservice programs adequately prepare the teacher for the initial experience, therefore the amount of assistance required is much greater than would be necessary. However, it is unclear what aspects of preservice training best prepare the teacher to enter the transition stage.

8. There is widespread agreement on the general character of the problems experienced and at least some agreement on what might best prepare a teacher for this transitional phase. It is a common belief, unsubstantiated by hard empirical data, that more practical experience prior to the beginning of full-time teaching is more likely to prepare a teacher. This statement in this form obviously cannot be completely true because what happens during that supervised practical experience cannot be of the same character as the uncontrolled events of the transition period itself.

9. Very little is known about the actual dynamics of this transition stage either in terms of the details of what it is like and how the teachers go through it or what in their prior experiences helped them to master this phase. The amount of research knowledge on both the transition phase and the conditions which facilitate mastering it and about the best ways to prepare teachers for it is extremely limited.

10. Very little evaluative information is available to demonstrate that any existing form of a teacher preparation program provides teachers with the best preparation for this transition period.

11. The British schemes for induction contain some promising models for assistance programs for teachers during the induction phase. The most effective models seem to be those in which direct help can be provided to each individual teacher on the specific problems he or she is having.

We do not pretend that each of these facts is indisputably supported by specific empirical data. The points listed are close approximations, actual facts, or minor extrapolations from data. We think that more detailed studies than those currently available in the literature will support these statements.

What is probably as important if not more important than this list of facts are the answers to some questions which have not as yet been properly formulated or asked by enough people to stimulate general interest in answering them. We turn now to these unanswered questions.

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

We do not at the present time know much about the factors that cause the kinds of problems which teachers have. There are three potential causes or sources of influence on these problems. One is the context in which the problem occurs. The available data suggest that context does not determine the problem but may affect its degree of severity. Most people believe, however, just the opposite; that certain school situations inevitably bring with them certain kinds of problems. Since the empirical evidence on this point is limited, obviously more data and analysis are needed.

Another set of factors which may influence the origination of problems are the personality characteristics and related background experiences of beginning teachers. Very little study has been done of this relation, though one would expect that individuals who are more anxiety-prone, who handle stress ineffectively and who have mediocre or poor problem-solving skills are more likely to be affected by the situations that beginning teachers confront.

We have already pointed out that we cannot identify particular aspects of the teacher preparation programs most likely to help the teacher master the transition period.

We do not know how each of these sources of variation may or may not be related to the character of the problems experienced by beginning teachers, their severity, or their extent. Each of the sets of variables may affect these factors differentially; for example, we might expect certain personality characteristics to affect the severity of a problem, whereas we would expect differences in training experiences to influence the kinds of problems one is likely to have.

We have little information about how teachers pass through the transition stage, other than to know that some apparently do so successfully, some do not. We have no detailed information on how those people who master the transition period do so. Nor do we have information on how different kinds of assistance or help directly or indirectly influence the teachers' successful mastery of the transition period.

We have practically no real information on three major questions:

(1) What is the precise nature and character of the problems teachers experience during the induction period, how extensive are they and how severe are they?

(2) What factors influence the generation of these problems, ameliorate them or influence more facile and rapid solution of them?

(3) What kinds of training or assistance programs or experiences have powerful effects on preventing, alleviating, or facilitating the solution of these problems?

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

We have proposed in this volume a general strategy for needed research and evaluation that is geared to the three unanswered questions above.

We have proposed a first stage of intensive, in-depth studies of the problem of beginning teachers which would follow a sample from one or more cohorts of beginning teachers at least from the time when they have secured a teaching position until shortly after the end of the first year of teaching. Other variations on this design would extend it further in time in both directions to examine more carefully the influence of a greater variety of antecedent conditions and to determine the longer-term effects.

We propose a second stage of research in which some experiments are conducted which test solutions for these problems. We recommend that these solutions be organized primarily by whether they are preventative or ameliorative—whether they are directed towards prevention of the problem or assistance to the teacher while it is occurring. We have also suggested a limited number of evaluation studies of the existing formats of programs for helping beginning teachers improve their skills as a way of assessing what kinds of variables within a program make that program effective as a training or professional improvement program.

This research and evaluation is designed to get at the basic information about the transition period which is now woefully lacking in the literature. There is little question that the problems of beginning teachers, and how to help them, is largely an unstudied area.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We do think that within a relatively short time sufficient progress could be made in both understanding the problems of beginning teachers and in developing the components for solutions that within a five-year period it would be possible to mount programs of greater scope and impact. What needs to be abandoned is the present ad hoc approach to the solution of these problems. There must be certain basic principles which can be developed and applied that would be the basis for solid programs that genuinely provide teachers with the kind of help they need when they need it.

Finding the ways of helping them is not an impossible task, but to do so we must have a concerted effort of research and development. This program, if carefully designed, can within a relatively short period of time produce the kinds of knowledge about these problems which will stimulate our creativity to generate solutions for these problems.

Research and evaluation studies should be the first steps toward creating such programs, but the policy studies necessary to develop these programs should also be begun at this time. The policy studies are important and necessary if this research and evaluation work is going to be translated into active programs. The transition into teaching is a neglected phase in the development of the teacher and for which no agency assumes full responsibility. The purpose of policy studies should be to make recommendations to change this situation.

We need to know how experienced teachers can be used in programs for beginning teachers. What role will they play? Will they need to be trained, and if so, by whom? What status should be assigned to them? What compensation should they receive?

What functions can be carried out by Teacher Centers? By inservice programs? By colleges and universities?

What program structures need to be developed? What agencies or levels of government should assume which responsibilities for program development? For training? For monitoring? For short-term and long-term assistance? For evaluation?

We do not think it opportune to recommend the internship as a device for solving the problems of beginning teachers because the evidence that it does is somewhat restricted and limited; nor do we see substantial reasons for recommending any other existing assistance schemes. We think that the issues of how to develop programs which help beginning teachers are largely unresolved, and it would be extremely unfortunate if decisions in this domain were made simply in terms of current practices or fads.

Internships and residencies are successful programs but they do not obviate the problems of beginning teachers. Assistance progams in school districts are useful and reasonably effective when they have certain characteristics, but they have other kinds of limitations which do not automatically recommend them. We have not found the perfect format or institutional location for a program that will help beginning teachers.

Beginning teachers need solid, genuine help. The first step in providing them this help is establishing the authority and responsibility for providing such help. At the same time we need to study more precisely what these problems are and discover the most effective ways of eliminating them, whatever the method may be. Once we have some notion of how to help teachers through the transition period so that they come out of it more effective than when they entered and with an interest in professional growth, we can make decisions about what political entities ought to create and manage these programs.

Beginning teachers are typically people in crisis. People in crisis need effective, efficient help. They do not need what someone thinks is the best form of help for them. The need a tested solution directed at the true nature of their problems. Our goal ought to be to reduce to the absolute minimum the amount of trauma, suffering, and floundering that too many beginning teachers experience.

Chapter 3

THE PROBLEMS OF BEGINNING TEACHERS

The period of entry into the teaching profession is almost invariantly described by teachers as one of stress and confusion. This phase in the life of a teacher is usually looked back on as one of great difficulty. It has rarely, if ever, been described as a joyous occasion. Descriptions of it are reminiscent of trials by fire. Some descriptions reveal serious physical reactions to the difficulties or problems of this period (Ryan, 1970).

There are a number of interesting and practical questions germane to the study of this period in the life of the teacher. Does it have to be as difficult as it is portrayed? Do the difficulties accrue because of lack of adequate training, or are they in some sense inevitable? What are the most significant aspects of this transition? What are the consequences of a successful passage through this transition period, and what do we mean by a successful passage? Does this period in the profession of teaching have analogues in other professions? Should we expect any professional to go through a stressful period of induction?

The answers to such questions will help us understand whether the transition period in teaching is affected largely by the training which precedes it, by where training occurs, or by the characteristics of the individuals who are entering the profession of teaching, or by the nature of the change from a preservice student to a responsible, authoritative, guiding, instructing and evaluating adult.

A theoretical case can be made that the transition period is affected by one of these factors exclusively or primarily. There are those, for example, who will argue that the strains of induction are due largely to the lack of practical experience prior to the induction period. Therefore, the induction can be eased by providing teachers with more practical experience before they actually begin teaching. A related view is that many of the problems which are met during the induction period can be anticipated during the training period.

Others will argue that the character of teaching is such that only aspects of it can be anticipated in training, that it is an experience which one must have in its totality and which cannot be easily simulated. Others will argue that the experiences of the induction period are determined by the characteristics of the individuals entering the profession. Some of these individuals are more self-reliant and adaptive, have inner resources which enable them to master such transitions; such individuals will not find this induction period particularly stressful or problematic. Of course, there will be those who maintain that all of these factors are significant influences on how the beginning teacher passes through this transition.

These remarks are intended to suggest that the label, "The Problems of Beginning Teachers," is a short-hand way of pointing to a complex transitory period in the life of the teacher about which we know relatively little. Further, it is a way of indicating that the choice of a label like "problems" is a way of shaping our perspective on the transition period, and to suggest that such labeling is one kind of perspective on that transition period. It may be an inadequate point of view, certainly it is likely to be a partial point of view, and it may be a view from only one perspective, that of those who have asked teachers about their early experiences in the profession.

An understanding of what happens to a beginning teacher and why is essential not simply to characterize the events of this period by label, but to understand how a person becomes an effective and professional teacher. We will describe as fully as we can on the basis of available literature and other sources of information what this period is like, what happens to the teacher during it, why it happens, what attempts have been made to ease this transition period and how this period related to the beginning of professional development.

DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES ON THE NEEDS OF BEGINNING TEACHERS

It is abundantly clear from the literature and talks with teachers that the transition period into teaching is viewed in different ways by four major groups of individuals, all of whom have at some time gone through this transition period or who observe it as it occurs in the lives of others. These four groups are the individuals going through the period, the beginning teachers themselves; experienced teachers; administrators and their staffs; and, the teacher trainers who have prepared the beginning teacher for the profession.

For the beginning teacher the transition period is one of great personal investment with serious consequences. If the beginning teacher negotiates the transition period successfully, he or she will be accepted into the profession and will assume that he or she has the skills necessary to live and work in this profession. The experienced teacher also has an investment in how beginning teachers master the transition period because this period shapes his or her colleagues as effective or ineffective teachers.

The administrative staff has a critical interest in the success of the beginning teacher both in the immediate present and for the long-term future. If the beginning teacher has considerable difficulty during this transition period, the consequences are immediate--disrupted and poorly taught classes; and the administrators gain or lose a teacher they have recruited and selected at some expense.

The trainers of teachers have an interest in this period because it reveals the effectiveness of their training. If the beginning teacher does not have sufficient skills in the art of teaching, the transition period is more likely to be unsuccessful, and this lack of success reflects on the teacher trainers.

In most schools beginning teachers are largely left on their own to learn how to manage and instruct. With the exceptions of certain kinds of training programs the period of support and supervision provided by a college or university ends with graduation. Although almost all school districts have some form of orientation program for the beginning teacher, this orientation is like that provided by the personnel divisions of any organization and is not directed to helping the new teacher master the tasks of the induction period. The beginning teacher's school district is not seen as an extension of the training system except when additional training specific to the district's goals or programs is needed. Nor have state agencies provided support for the transitional period into teaching (with one exception--Georgia).

Because the problems of the beginning teacher, whatever their nature and complexity, are largely unstudied, there are few institutional support systems for this transitional period. Perhaps this failure results from the different ways in which this transition period is seen. In the following sections we explore what these different perspectives are and what their implications might be.

The Perspective of the Teacher Trainers

Surveys of what has been written about the training of teachers and their entrance into the profession reveal first, that the literature on the transition period is very small in proportion to the literature on the nature of effective teaching, professionalism, teacher education, and the problems of teaching; and second, the literature on teacher education is almost exclusively written from the perspective of what a professional teacher ought to be like. Proposals for teacher education are almost invariably described in terms of the ultimate product, the experienced and professional teacher. There are several reasons why this perspective is taken.

The teacher-training institution regards itself as responsible for the quality of the teachers who enter the profession. This responsibility, however, is almost exclusively discharged by the selection of teacher-training candidates and the education of them up to the point where they are credentialed. The provision for further education is unorganized and unfocused compared to the preservice period of preparation. Master's degree programs are varied in character, are not required of every teacher, nor are inservice programs offered by every college to teachers.

Teacher educators advocate from the first days of the preservice program an ideal of what the teacher ought to be. They endeavor in their training programs to help individuals become as much like these models as possible. In a very real sense the teacher education program is future-oriented. Realistically, such programs do not expect to provide the fully accomplished professional teacher, but they use their limited resources to train as if the achievement of this goal was possible.

Considerable energy is expended in making teacher trainees as much like a model of professional teachers as possible. The resources for doing so are very limited so the task inevitably is unfinished. But the perspective of teacher educators is largely uninfluenced by this reality.

It would be unfair to teacher educators to assume, though some teachers apparently do so, that they are totally unaware of the "realities" of school life. In fact, the literature on teacher education refers to such realities frequently (Gaede, 1978). Various reforms in teacher education have been promoted to help teachers cope with the realities of classroom teaching, the Competency-Based Teacher Education movement being the most recent example. But the perspective of the teacher educator is the long-term professional perspective, and is usually seen by teachers and administrators as unrealistic. It is unrealistic if a training program ignores the realities of the transition period into teaching.

Teacher educators appear to be detached from what is happening to their recently graduated clients. This is not surprising because their graduates are dispersed; they have little if any contact with them; and they are immersed in training the next group.

What is puzzling is that success in mastering the transition period is not seen as the primary criterion of the effectiveness of the teacher-training program. Perhaps the perspective of the long view overlooks the relevance and criticality of the immediate consequences of training.

The Perspective of the Beginning Teacher

The beginning teacher's perspective is extremely narrow and understandably so. Beginning teachers are immersed in a set of rapidly changing events which they do not fully understand. They are unsure of their ability to control these events though they know that failure to control them will inevitably have serious consequences for them. They do not in the beginning days of teaching see much beyond their own needs in the classroom for that immediate day or a particular hour of that day. They are not interested in the larger issues of education, of the school, or of the school district.

In the earliest days of teaching they are psychologically isolated, having few friends in the school, living in an environment that is strange and unfamiliar to them, not knowing where to turn for help, and having largely themselves as the principal resource for solving their problems. They exist in this world six hours a day, five days a week. During the first month of teaching, perhaps the most difficult time, they may not even be visited by another teacher. When they are visited, it is most likely to be by a member of the administrative staff who carries the aura of evaluation, no matter how personally supportive or interested that person may be.

The perspective of the beginning teacher is the perspective of a foot-soldier in the earliest days of entrance into warfare. We are not surprised therefore to find teachers' perspectives on problems to be quite different from the perspectives of their trainers. For them the period of transition is reality; for the trainer it is one aspect of a long sequence of developmental events. The beginning teacher can describe this period in graphic detail whereas the teacher educators, no matter how concerned they may be about this transition period, are more detached in their views of it.

The Perspective of the Experienced Teacher

Experienced teachers are periodically asked by a graduate student doing a dissertation or by a representative of a teachers' organization or a researcher, how well they were prepared for teaching. They say what beginning teachers say. Both experienced and beginning teachers will point to the need for classroom management skills, or learning to control classes, or being able to cope with "discipline problems." But the experienced teachers' reconstruction of the past identifies needs which clearly emerged after they had gone through the beginning of the transition period. They describe the need for teachers to understand school procedures for such things as discipline and the implementation of state and federal mandates. They mention problems of gaining acceptance in the informal structure of the school.

In one sense they become more like the teacher trainers who also view the needs of beginning teachers as what teachers need as they accommodate and adapt to the profession. The teacher educators differ from the experienced teachers in that they hold up a model of professionalization of teaching while experienced teachers are talking about school specific kinds of adjustments and involvement.

The Perspective of the Employer

The perspective of the employer is most likely to be a perspective from the vantage point of the needs of the school district. In some school districts the administration is concerned about the general effectiveness of the teachers, but in others the district is more concerned that the teachers have certain kinds of skills and be able to address certain kinds of problems or be prepared to meet certain needs of the children. A school district, for example, with a large minority population may be working on the development of reading skills among these children, and would therefore be concerned that teachers be able to teach reading to minority pupils. This task requires technical skill, as well as an understanding of children of different ethnic and racial backgrounds whose learning opportunities prior to schooling may have been limited, and whose progress in school may have been somewhat slower than children from the majority socioeconomic class or ethnic group. This teaching requires acceptance of differences in cultural viewpoints and habits. The school district wants teachers with these attitudes, knowledge and skills whether they are beginners or experienced teachers.

The school district may have developed special curricula, and therefore wants teachers who are prepared to teach the topics or subjects of these curricula. A not uncommon case occurs when a school district has adopted a very structured and detailed curriculum which requires the teacher to have specific training to manage that curriculum. The school district will either expect the teacher to have had the necessary training or will offer a course of training designed to help the teacher carry out the prescribed curriculum.

The perspective of the school district is immediate, concrete, and parochial. It should not be surprising that its perspective is of this character because the district is concerned with immediate problems and political pressures. It judges the beginning teachers by how well they "fit in" and how well they can teach the priority curricula.

HOW DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES AFFECT THE EDUCATION OF BEGINNING TEACHERS

The most immediate consequence for the education of teachers of these different perspectives is that each of them leads logically to a different kind of training program for the beginning teacher. If one takes the perspective of school districts, for example, the immediate goal of the training program should be to prepare the beginning teacher to conduct the curriculum of the school district.

One source of disagreement arising from the different perspectives is the level to which teachers should be prepared by the time they enter the teaching profession. Should a teacher be prepared to cope with most of the problems he or she will experience in the first year or two of teaching, or should we expect teachers to learn some important skills of teaching during this first year? The teachers themselves believe that they have not been prepared adequately even to cope with this first year, but this view is largely ignored by the teacher trainers who believe that they have prepared the teacher to be a competent professional.

Beginning teachers and experienced teachers see the substance of their training somewhat differently and both views differ from that of their trainers. They do not agree with teacher educators on what is critical or what the priority needs of beginning teachers are. The consequence is that the training provided by the educational institution is seen as unrealistic, theoretical, and too remote from daily practice. In actuality this training might be most useful once the beginning teacher has gotten through the problems of the first half-year or so of teaching. But if this training is largely rejected after the first weeks of teaching, it will not be used in these later stages when the teacher might be able to use it.

The major consequence of these different points of view is that there is a lack of agreement on, and perhaps interest in, the structure and organization of education and training for the continuing professional development of teachers. It is not generally agreed that a planned and required program of professional education for the teacher should continue beyond graduation from the preservice program. All agree that the teacher should continue to grow professionally, that inservice education is useful and necessary, and that advanced education is desirable. But the pattern of requirements for continuing education in a program of professional development varies from no requirements to a requirement for completing a Master's degree. The nature of what is to be covered in these required programs varies considerably and frequently is left to the discretion of the teacher, his or her graduate advisor or to the administrators of the teacher's district.

That these views are now in open conflict is clear from the emergence of the teacher-center movement. The rhetoric supporting this movement, a rhetoric apparently believed by substantial numbers of teachers, is that teachers need to "control" their own development and education, that teachers know best what they need in the way of training or education, and that teachers themselves are the best teachers of other teachers.

While this rhetoric may seem extreme and in some cases fanciful, it appears that teachers believe that it has a substantial element of truth in it. Even if it were not true, the perception of its being true seriously affects how teachers perceive the education and training that is offered to them by the university. Teacher centers, however, have made no serious moves to provide the kinds of programs beginning teachers need.

These different perspectives may have kept the training of teachers from expanding or changing. There is no way now to prove this particular point, but given that people act on their views, it is not surprising to find relatively little change in the forms of teacher education, whether preservice or inservice, over several decades. Major innovations have not in fact been innovations but temporary demonstrations. Competency-based teacher education is an excellent and most recent example of this point. Because beginning teachers are relatively powerless in the institutions that employ and train them, their views have had little impact on training.

We also do not know to what extent ignoring the stated needs of beginning teachers has created conditions for failing to achieve their potential or to an outright failure to succeed in the profession. It seems likely that the inattentiveness of the university training programs to the highly specific needs of the beginning teachers has had a deleterious effect on their success.

We are impressed with the discrepancy between the way the beginning teacher sees the world and the way everybody else sees his or her world. Although we do not and cannot substantiate the effects of these differences with hard data, the logic of our view that these differences have serious consequences for the design of programs and for the development of effective beginning teachers seems sound.

THE PEOPLE WHO ENTER TEACHING AND THEIR PROBLEMS AS BEGINNING TEACHERS

Perhaps one of the most interesting lines of inquiry about beginning teachers would be studies of how their characteristics determine or influence the kinds of problems they have. Those who enter teacher-training programs and subsequently enter teaching are diverse as individuals but have certain characteristics in common. It is important to raise the question, even though we cannot answer it, whether or not these characteristics are related to the kinds of problems beginning teachers have.

An example may serve to illustrate this point. The teaching profession has a substantial contingent of women in its ranks. Elementary school teachers are largely women as are about half of the high school teachers. When beginning and experienced teachers report that "discipline" is a problem, how much of the problem, particularly in the upper grades, is related to the fact that women are teachers? Unfortunately, in the literature on beginning teachers, the differences in stated problems or needs is usually not analyzed by the sex of the respondents. We do not know whether or not more women report having discipline problems than men, a small fact but an important one to understanding whether or not differences in the sex of teachers are related to the kinds of problems beginning teachers have.

We could speculate that since women are thought to be more nurturing and perhaps less aggressive or assertive than men, that they would initially have more difficulty asserting themselves in classrooms. If this were so, then the reporting of the problem as a critical problem for beginning teachers ought to be looked at from the perspective of this difference rather than as a generic problem.

Similar questions may be asked about differences in age, ethnic and racial group membership, socioeconomic background, college or university attended, region of the country, grade and subjects taught. Such differences are easily analyzed if the relevant data are gathered. Potentially interesting differences related to core personality characteristics require more complex research strategies and methods than those used in the typical study of beginning teachers. Studies of all of these relations are well within the state of the art. But in our literature review we were not able to find data on these relations.

The data on the general characteristics of people entering this profession are well known, and these characteristics have remained essentially stable for over a half century. Lortie (1975) uses the characteristics of the clientele entering the profession to speculate about the consequences for teaching and for the profession of teaching. In this section we will discuss briefly some of these characteristics and point to the possibilities for relations among these characteristics and the problems of beginning teachers.

Perhaps the most interesting characteristics of individuals entering the profession are the major motives for doing so. These are reported to be largely a desire to work with people and a "service" orientation (Lortie, 1975). In a survey conducted by the National Education Association, to which Lortie refers, about half of the teachers were interested in joining the teaching profession because they wanted to work with people, and another quarter because they wanted to help people or society. The profession therefore is composed of people who are altruistic and who have essentially a service-orientation, a service which involves working directly with individuals.

Contrast these characteristics with those of individuals who enter the sciences or engineering. The individuals in these professions may enter them for significant social purposes but not because achieving these purposes requires working directly with people. An engineer may be improving the physical world in which we live, a service which is of benefit to people. To provide this service he has to work with other people such as construction workers, but his service is not essentially a service directly to individuals in the same way that a teacher's service is directly to individuals. A similar comparison may be made between the work of a scientist and the work of a teacher.

Differences of these kinds are significant because they are associated with differences in life-style, differences in interests and values, and habits and patterns of work. We would expect teachers therefore to have different kinds of problems entering their profession than engineers or scientists have entering their professions. A beginning teacher interested in working with children and young people is likely to be highly threatened by the unresponsiveness of his or her clients and dismayed by hostility or aggressiveness displayed by these clients. The beginning teacher may feel the need to be accepted, and when met with indifference or hostility, may be devastated. Thus the beginning teachers' problems may arise from their own expectations about the nature of their work, expectations which are created by their own needs (Ryan, 1970).

Beginning teachers are offering a service which will help the individual students develop and achieve benefits which accrue from being better educated. Teachers are teaching children certain kinds of intellectual and interpersonal skills that will be useful to them throughout their lives. But their students do not voluntarily seek this service; they are constrained to accept it. If the children do not value these skills, the teacher may not see how he or she can perform the service intended, and may be disappointed, depressed, or may feel incompetent.

The beginning teacher provides a service that involves dispensing knowledge and creating situations in which a pupil can acquire skills. The teacher must himself or herself have this knowledge and skill available, and must also be able to organize a system of instruction. The under-educated, unskilled teacher who cannot instruct well may be threatened by quicker, competent pupils. Even though the teacher-training program focuses on what the teacher needs to know and how to teach it, the beginning teachers may not have acquired sufficient skill to work with the variety of individuals who are to be the recipients of their services. Thus a certain amount of unsureness about how to provide these varied services will lead to a lack of confidence and discouragement when the beginning teacher finds himself or herself less than completely effective or when his or her services are subtly or summarily rejected.

These are a few examples of how the characteristics of beginning teachers may predispose them to have certain kinds of problems. Other problems which the beginning teachers have relate to the nature of the teaching task itself. This task places demands on all teachers and until beginning teachers learn how to meet those demands, they will have problems with those tasks. Still other problems occur because school and classroom situations exist over which the beginning teacher has little or no control but which create or exacerbate teaching and interpersonal problems (e.g., pupils using drugs). But such changes may be temporary or confined to certain locales or certain levels of education, hence, not all beginning teachers are affected by them.

FACTORS INFLUENCING BEGINNING TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR PROBLEMS

The major source of data on which we have relied is the information which beginning teachers themselves give about their problems. Most of this literature reports relatively simple kinds of surveys in which beginning teachers are asked to list their problems or to check off items in a prepared list. Few if any distinctions are made about when these problems occur, how long they persist, what factors influence them and other variables which one would expect would characterize both the nature of the problem and their development or resolution.

Factors Related to Differences in School and Pupil Characteristics

We have found few instances in which statements about problems are analyzed by their sources or the conditions under which they occur. Certain kinds of problems logically occur with greater frequency in certain kinds of schools. When analyses have been made of the differences between beginning teachers in urban and suburban schools, however, the same kinds of problems are reported--but some of them are reported as more severe in certain kinds of schools than in others. Discipline, for example, is a code name for the pupil behavior problems the beginning teacher encounters. All beginning teachers report coping with discipline problems as one of their major problems. Beginning teachers in inner-city schools report this problem as of greater severity or intensity, and in some cases different in kind, but not always more frequently than other beginning teachers. This problem is usually ranked first among the problems of greatest concern to beginning teachers.*

It is difficult to tell from the literature if this similarity in problems reported is a function of the fact that problems are relatively independent of situations or whether it is a function of the methodology used. When teachers respond to a check list, the investigator can only report what they have checked. Whether they had other problems or whether they would have categorized what is actually happening to them in terms of the items of the list is unknown. However, the same general kinds of problems tend to emerge whether generated from a check list or described in statements provided by the beginning teachers or quoted. The concurrence among data sources suggests that the problems of beginning teachers are generic and relatively independent of situations.

Another problem in assessing the reliability and validity of the beginning teachers' perceptions of their problems has been one of sampling. The samples for most surveys have been available samples. Frequently individuals surveyed have just completed student teaching, and are not really beginning teachers; others are teachers who are available in the locale and readily accessible; while still others are samples of experienced teachers. The problems with retrospective surveys are well known. There are no systematic surveys of large, diversified samples of beginning teachers.

---

*The metric varies from study to study. Rank-ordering and rating are the most common responses elicited. "Frequency of Problem" is usually a rating, not a count. Despite these variations, "Discipline Problems" and "Management Problems" usually are ranked first and rated highest in terms of severity.

Because of these limitations of the available literature, the extent to which problems differ by locale or type of student is not known. In general they seem not to, an interesting fact of which we would be somewhat suspicious because of the nature of the methodologies that have been used. But experienced teachers located in urban, suburban, and rural areas did not report different problems with pupils (Lambert, 1976). These data were difficult for people to accept even though the survey was carefully designed and conducted with a relatively small sample of teachers who were participating in a more extensive study.

Certain kinds of problems may be a function of the nature of teaching and may occur whenever somebody is beginning to learn to teach. This view was more common thirty years ago than it is today. Today, because of the attention to the diversities in the pupil population, we assume that teachers' problems will differ from school to school.

This kind of problem can be studied more systematically. In a later portion of this report we will make recommendations to that effect. There really is no reason, other than that the studies have not been done, to be as uninformed as the profession apparently is about the range of beginning teachers' problems and whether or not these vary by the kind of school in which people teach and the kinds of pupils whom they teach.

At present it seems safe to conclude that for certain kinds of problems differences of this kind are not significant. It may be that differences by type of school or type of pupil occur only when such differences are extreme. Or it may be that the qualitative character of the problem is the same to the perceiver even though the phenomenal characteristics of the problem are obviously different. Or researchers may have missed the important qualitative differences.

Factors Related to the Sequence in Which Problems Occur

The literature provides little description of the problems of beginning teachers as they occur from the first day on which they teach through a substantial period of time. We do not have even the equivalent of Roger Barker's, "One Boy's Day," describing one teacher's day, week or month.

As we have described earlier, the project staff included two experienced teachers (one of whom had also been an administrator of an elementary school). They and teachers we talked to could describe in detail how they felt on their first day and during the first week of teaching, how these feelings changed, what they did not know at the time but then became aware of and learned to cope with during their first year of teaching.

We put this information together with what we knew about the ordinary course of the year in the elementary or secondary school. Certain kinds of events occur with predictable regularity. There is a time early in the school year when the new teacher will be observed and evaluated by administrative or supervisory staff. This occasion may be repeated at several points through the year but the process of being observed and evaluated is a new event the first time it occurs for the beginning teacher. When it occurs early in the new teacher's experience, it is a very threatening event. Preparing for an evaluation, while a problem for any teacher, has unique features for beginning teachers because of their lack of experience with it and because of the potential significance of the results this early to their career.

The beginning teacher must also work in certain kinds of relations with people which develop gradually as the year moves along, most notably with the parents of the children whom the teacher is teaching. The teacher usually meets these parents for the first time at some type of open-house activity near the beginning of the school year. The teacher must provide information to the parents about their child's performance usually in a private conference with them. The teacher must provide grades or other records about these pupils periodically. These are events which create a problem for the beginning teacher simply because the beginning teacher has had little or no preparation for coping with these new events.

As we proceeded to interview our assistants, talk among ourselves, and work through the literature, it became apparent that the most sensible way to think about the problems of beginning teachers was in terms of a sequence. It is obvious that not all problems occur immediately at the beginning of the year, either because the time for them has not arrived, or because the beginning teacher does not perceive that they are important. It is also apparent that the beginning teacher focuses on certain kinds of highly critical problems in the beginning of the year and either is unaware of or ignores all other problems. These other problems come into awareness at later points in the year.

It seems to us that classing and mapping this sequence of events is an important research activity both for understanding what is happening to the beginning teacher and for developing systems for supporting the beginning teacher. It is our conclusion after studying various systems that the timing of support to help teachers cope with certain kinds of problems is uncorrelated or not highly correlated with the occurrence of the problem. We provide information about a problem the teacher is not aware of before he or she becomes aware of it or before the problem occurs. By the time the problem occurs the information is forgotten or half-remembered or may not even be recognized as relevant. Precise information on when certain kinds of problems come into the awareness of the beginning teacher would have considerable practical utility and would also help us to understand how teachers develop.

Factors Affecting the Duration of Problems

If one conclusion is apparent in this study, it is that beginning teachers solve their own problems very much by themselves. This conclusion does not denigrate the supervisory help they received or the assistance from colleagues they receive, but the amount of such help is relatively limited, particularly in proportion to the range and magnitude of the problems facing the beginning teacher.

It is obvious that beginning teachers will occasionally ask for assistance from their colleagues, but we have no idea how many do this or how many do it and find it ineffective, or how many do it and find the help particularly useful. We do know that supervisors give assistance but again we have no precise information on the amount, frequency and quality of such help, though we are reasonably sure that it is not extensive. We are sure that beginning teachers, even those participating in structured programs designed to assist them, all report the need for more assistance.

Because we know so little about how problems are solved by beginning teachers, we are also ignorant about the duration of these problems. It is clear that some problems are not solved by some beginning teachers, and as a consequence these beginning teachers either develop an ineffective teaching style or their problems become so overwhelming that they leave the profession. Some of the best examples of such problems are those relating to the management of classes. There are teachers who persist in managing classes poorly and seem to be unaware of the consequences of this poor management.

Some problems by their very nature are likely to be of short duration if appropriate action is taken. A problem like learning the names of children is an immediate problem the first day and during the first week. It is a problem that is readily and quickly solved if the teacher goes about solving it sensibly. An elementary teacher who did not know the names of his or her pupils would be unusual. Secondary teachers, of course, have the persistent problem of trying to learn the names of the large number of students whom they see for relatively short periods of time each day, but their problem is of a different character than that of the elementary school teacher. Another problem at the secondary level is how to utilize relatively impersonal relations constructively for the instructional benefit of students.

Other problems are likely to persist over somewhat longer periods of time. The beginning teacher can learn easily some of the ways of establishing good management strategies. The teacher will of course have a management problem until these strategies are put into practice and begin to work. So this problem is likely to persist for a week or two even when the teacher is working appropriately at its solution. It is, however, a problem likely to recur periodically and not necessarily in the form in which it occurred originally.

Some problems recur independently of anything that the teacher does. For example, how does a teacher cope with the pupils who miss work. The teacher has little or no control over the occurrence of this problem. But the teacher can learn to solve the problem the first or second time that it occurs and then repeat the method of solution.

Our point is that we know relatively little about the character of problems in terms of how long they last and the factors that influence their occurrence, reoccurrence, or solution. To understand the problems of beginning teachers we need such information.

In our analyses we have attempted to understand and find out about variations in the character of problems. In the descriptions which follow we have made some preliminary speculations or guesses about such characteristics, but we frankly admit we have very little data to support our speculations. We offer them in order to stimulate interest in the problem.

Analyses of this kind are essential if we are to develop effective systems for helping beginning teachers. If we know that certain problems are going to occur repeatedly requiring essentially the same kind of solution, we can train teachers in the appropriate solutions and help them acquire a repertoire of successful coping skills. Other problems will acquire more extensive and intensive training and supervision because, if they are not solved adequately, they will continue and may eventually become uncontrollable. Management problems are of this character and more precise knowledge about their occurrence in the classes of beginning teachers is essential to helping these teachers solve them.

QUALITATIVE CHANGES IN BEGINNING TEACHERS AS THEY SOLVE PROBLEMS

As the beginning teacher solves the successive sets of problems, their perceptions change. We have an impression of the beginning teacher as having tunnel vision in looking at problems. The beginning teacher appears to focus on the problems most directly related to controlling the environment in which they are working and in fact are creating. Once they have solved these problems, their perceptions widen and they can be responsive to events happening in their classes which they did not previously notice.

When the beginning teacher has developed basic strategies for managing pupils, he or she now perceives previously unseen instructional problems. The teacher, for example, notices that the instructional methods are not producing the desired results; whereas before this time the teacher paid more attention to the management problems and may have thought that relative ineffectiveness in managing was accounting for some of the undesirable instructional consequences. From the teacher's point of view the children were not learning because they were not paying enough attention, or they did not work at their tasks well, or they were in an inappropriate group which spent most of its time "fooling around." But now the teachers sees the problem as one of providing appropriate materials for the children, either materials that are more interesting to them or materials from which they can learn more easily. The teacher now has a new problem, that of differentiating the work materials, a problem that would not have been noticed as long as his or her focus remained on the earlier management problem.

We do not know, but suspect, that there is a progressive enlarging of perception and understanding as teachers solve problems. We are also aware that some teachers do not make these kinds of changes. Some teachers "solve" a management problem but never see new problems. Research therefore has two tasks. One task is to describe this process of solving a problem and then moving on to new problems of which the teacher becomes aware. The second task is finding out why some teachers will solve a problem but then not move to a new stage of professional development or activity or to a new stage of problem solving.

STRUCTURAL FACTORS AFFECTING BEGINNING TEACHERS PROBLEMS

By "structural factors" we mean the system in which the teacher works--whether or not the beginning teacher has supervisory help available who visit the teacher regularly, or whether or not beginning teachers have their own program that gives them an opportunity to learn from supervisors and from each other. Support systems of these kinds presumably influence a teacher's rate of development, but at the present time relatively little is known about how such factors directly influence the development of a beginning teacher.

Obviously such support systems should be very helpful, but we do not know how helpful they can be. There may be other ways of providing help that are more effective.

It is also apparently true that some kinds of help are not very effective but not necessarily because the help is inappropriate. There is considerable comment among teachers that evaluative help is not effective and may be detrimental. There seems to be good reason to believe this but the data on this point are non-existent. We do not know what kind of help interferes with the developement of the teacher.

We think, however, that factors of this kind are critical in the solution of the problems of beginning teachers. Much of the programmatic activity that we discuss in this report is work designed to help teachers solve their initial problems or to facilitate their induction into the teaching profession. We will speculate on a number of potentially influential factors in these programs as a way of stimulating thinking about how to help beginning teachers and suggesting directions for future research.

RESPONSIVENESS OF BEGINNING TEACHERS TO WAYS TO SOLVE THEIR PROBLEMS

For a variety of reasons individual teachers are more or less open to problem solving. Individual teachers are more or less autonomous in coping with problems. Some seem to be able to generate their own resources for help in such matters, others seem to be very dependent on being led to solutions. Some are more adaptive and flexible, others are more rigid.

Again we must report that the literature on how such differences in personal characteristics affect initial induction into the profession is a very sparse literature indeed. Generally it does not go beyond what we know about problem-solving capacities and characteristics. Whether or not unique personal characteristics are required to adapt quickly to the problems facing new teachers is unknown.

We have been describing a series of categories of events that describe both how problems may be perceived by beginning teachers and what factors may influence their own solution of their problems. We do not have a theory of development or a theory of learning built from a careful study of beginning teachers as they cope with their induction into the profession. We have not let the lack of theoretical guidelines deter us from putting data together in a form which, if tested, might suggest whether this process is developmental or a problem to be attacked from the viewpoint of learning theory.

THE TRANSITION PERIOD: DEVELOPMENTAL CHANGE, LEARNING NEW SKILLS, OR COPING?

Not only are the facts about beginning teachers few, but theories, models and paradigms of the processes of change associated with the transition period have neither been generated nor applied from available conceptual schemas. The absence of conceptual analysis means that proposals and programs for preparing teachers for or assisting them during the transition period are at best ad hoc arrangements, and in some cases, foolish notions or compromises of viewpoints arranged for political reasons.

It is significant that such little theoretical work has been done on the problems of beginning teachers. The literature is replete with surveys of these problems but very little theoretical analysis has been done and that only in the context of explaining some results of these surveys. The study of these problems is intellectually impoverished and investigators seem to be confounded and baffled by the intractability of the problems--every investigator finds essentially the same results as his or her predecessors.

In this section we will consider four major kinds of psychological theories which might help us explain or understand why this period in the life of a teacher has its present character. We ask in this analysis:

would this particular theory account for what is known about the period? If the theory does have explanatory power and validity, what paradigms for programs could be designed?

Two facts are obvious. One of these is that teachers go through a sequence of problems which they learn to solve. Some of these problems are inherent in the tasks of teaching. Some are related to the sequence of events that occur in school and others are related to individual characteristics of particular teachers.

Are there developmental stages through which the beginning teacher goes? There are reasons to suspect this may be the case. It is not surprising that the beginning teacher has a very limited perspective on problems in the first few days or weeks of teaching. It is relatively easy to understand why the teacher at any one time sees only certain portions of the environment in which they are working, certain kinds of interactions, certain kinds of activities, and certain kinds of problems.

But progressive change is not necessarily definitive evidence of developmental change. For example, a person may learn different aspects of a skill at different times. Frequently, the person learns the simpler aspects first and then the more complex components of the skill. It is an inductive leap, however, to conclude that what has been observed is evidence of ontogenetic development. The question is, which theory--a developmental theory, a theory of adaptation or coping, or a learning theory, or some combination or integration of them--best accounts for the facts we have observed.

A Theory of Adaption or Coping as a Paradigm for the Analysis of the Problems of Beginning Teachers

Is the best explanation of the processes of teacher change inherent in a theory of adaption or coping? For those who use the word "cope" in its broadest sense the obvious answer to this question is "Yes". If we mean by "coping", solving problems, there is a superficial sense in which beginning teachers solve problems because they do manage to resolve certain critical situations. If, however, we mean by problem-solving, bringing to bear on a situation the knowledge, experience, and analytic, conceptual and practical tools learned in other situations, then it is unlikely that many beginning teachers cope in this sense. Usually a theory of coping assumes this narrower definition of the word; if it did not, coping would merely be a synonym for change.

A theory of coping is essentially a theory of dynamic transfer. It explains how new situations are comprehended, and understood; how a person uses processes he can generate to solve problems in this new situation. It is a theory that explains the power of an individual to adapt to a new situation; and to grow further as a result of making such adaptations.

Almost any situation requiring change of habits or attitudes or views or that requires problem solving is ripe for using a coping theory. But a coping theory is relevant only if two conditions are met: 1) that persons in the new situation give some evidence of solving problems; 2) that the processes of transfer can be identified; which means that we can point to situations where the person has learned relevant ways of thinking or acting and that we can identify what is being used from the past and how it is used in the new situation. In short, a coping theory is an explanation of adaptation processes; these adaptation processes must be identified to use a coping theory validly and sensibly.

We are reasonably certain of some facts relevant to deciding whether the beginning teacher is coping. The beginning teacher usually has not faced before the kinds of problems which occur during the first few months of school.

Nor is it easy to point to analogues of these problems with which a beginning teacher is likely to have had some experience. Some have worked with children or young people in positions such as a camp counseler or youth-group leader. Although these positions do provide an opportunity to work with young people, to supervise and to manage them, they usually involve much less responsibility than does the position of a teacher. These other experiences may be useful but they hardly provide the trial-by-fire experience of the first few weeks and months of teaching. There is, therefore, little to carry over from these experiences into teaching, and these experiences have only minor influences on the development of a teacher.

If the reports of beginning teachers mean anything, they definitely mean that the beginning teacher is floundering when they start to teach. As they say in study after study, they have not been prepared for the initial experiences of teaching. On this point the teachers are unambiguously clear and almost universally in agreement.

A teacher, beginner or experienced, uses whatever skills or behaviors "work" in a distressful situation. The experienced teacher relies heavily on what has worked in the past. This teacher can be said to be coping--using in a new situation knowledge and skill previously acquired, adapting them to this situation to solve a problem.

But the beginning teacher usually does not know what to do, and has no comparable specific experiences on which to fall back. He or she tries various approaches, almost superstitiously; his or her behavior may be no more that the product of panic or fear. What we see is how the teacher copes with fear. In this respect coping theory may be useful to account for or to predict the beginning teacher's behavior.

But some use of past experience must occur. Teachers may cope by using broader skills or habits they have used to handle other situations. An interesting analysis from the viewpoint of coping theory, for example, is how teachers generalize from other interpersonal relations to those of the classroom. Are those who have been the older members of families replicating their relations with their younger siblings? Are teachers who are afraid of people also reacting like fearful people in the classroom, being suspicious and distrustful of the students? Are teachers who are friendly and open with people responding the same way to the children in their classes? These questions point to the obvious fact that a teacher has certain experiences in interpersonal relations and will act in the classroom in ways that utilize the skills and understanding acquired in previous relationships.

It seems unlikely that the teacher who is totally disorganized in teaching is disorganized only in the classroom. The teacher who cannot sequence events in a systematic way is probably an individual who responds in other situations in a random manner or to whatever stimulus is most striking at a particular time. We would expect these characteristics to influence how the beginning teacher interacts and manages in the first few weeks and months of school. The beginning teacher will probably use the most significant coping habits in his or her repertoire.

If we assume that coping theory is likely to be at least a partially useful explanatory theory, then we will be more interested in studying the beginning teacher prior to actual teaching in order to assess the variety of life skills which he or she possesses. We will also be interested in their general strategy for managing situations; can they take responsibility for others' learning? Can they give directions? Can they indicate what work is to be done and follow-up on its performance? Can they evaluate work fairly and directly? Can they give coherent explanations? Can they plan? Can they organize and interrelate the parts of activities? These are certainly among the critical skills required for teaching and coping theory would predict that the degree to which beginning teachers have these skills, the more likely they are to use them.

The problem with using coping theory, however, is that it does not account for those cases where people have the relevant skills but do not use them. We do not know if or how many such cases occur in beginning teaching. Are the beginning teachers who have very great difficulties in managing classes also individuals who have certain interpersonal difficulties outside the classroom?

The difficulties of using a theory of coping to explain the problems of beginning teachers are obvious when we think in explanatory terms about these problems. If we were using a coping theory, we would make statements of the form, "This teacher is having these difficulties because she has not learned to cope with......" Many statements of this kind are made; for example, "This teacher is having these difficulties because she does not know how to manage (cope with) unruly pupils." But a close examination of that statement indicates that it is merely a tautology because the difficulties are the unmanageability of the unruly pupil, and nothing has been explained by the statement.

In order to offer an explanation we would have to use a higher order construct which would be an instance of coping behavior which could be expected to be applied in this situation; for example, "This teacher has difficulties with unruly pupils because she does not see that they are trying to win the approval of other pupils in the class." The teacher described in this statement has not learned from experience with people that an individual will take advantage of another in order to create an impression on a third person. If the teacher had this insight into what is occurring in the classroom, he or she ought to be able to use it to find ways to solve the problem. In this way general knowledge and experience and interpersonal skill provide a basis for interacting with pupils in class.

We see three possibilities: 1) some habits are readily transferrable from situation to situation and these habits probably are among those necessary to be effective in teaching; 2) some habits may have worked in one situation but are unworkable in another and one courts disaster by making the transfer; 3) some habits have positive and negative values which may vary from situation to situation. Coping means essentially being able to transfer what one has learned in one situation to a new situation where it will be useful. Therefore the set of habits and skills useful in teaching are also likely to be among the habits and skills useful in some other situations. But before we can use a theory of coping to explain why beginning teachers have problems and as the basis of a paradigm for developing programs to help them, we need to know what habits are needed to teach effectively and whether these habits are likely to have been learned in other situations. Assuming that such identifications could be made, the transition into teaching could be ameliorated by teaching beginners how to transfer these habits to teaching.

The Advantages of a Coping Theory Point of View. One advantage of using coping theory as a way of thinking about teaching problems is that it focuses our attention on adult capacities for problem-solving and for mastery. It is our suspicion that one of our difficulties in solving the problems of beginning teachers is that the beginning teacher is seen as a student by his or her mentors and as an adult by his or her peers in teaching. During training, because he or she is seen as a student who is learning he or she is treated gently and tolerantly. The teacher candidate is encouraged to try things and not to be afraid to make mistakes. If mistakes are made the penalties are usually not too severe. But the teacher's peers expect a fully competent colleague and are likely to be intolerant of marked ineffectiveness.

The beginning teacher passes through this gap between the late adolescent period, lived in the contained atmosphere of the training institution, and the adult world of teaching. The beginning teacher moves almost immediately from the world of the student to the world of the adult, and the beginner who does not have adult coping capacity, is likely to have serious problems and difficulties in learning to teach.

We offer these reflections and observations on coping theory because the theoretical point of view we, as educators, take towards these problems does determine our understanding of them as well as what we will propose to do practically about them. Coping theory enables us to see the beginning teacher as an adult or a person placed in an adult role who may or may not have had previous experience with any adult role or with such a limited range of them that he or she has not acquired the habits that can be transferred to the new situation of teaching. Coping theory is useful therefore in thinking about the broad categories of competence an individual needs in order to be a successful adult in an occupation and the kinds of adult habits one needs for this particular occupation.

Our analysis here suggests that coping theory is probably most useful for studying the problems of beginning teachers as a phenomenon of adult adaptation to an occupation, with all that such a paradigm implies about the quality and character of experience one has had with the adult world before entering teaching. The use of the theory will focus attention on the kinds of general life-skills which one needs to cope with new situations such as initial teaching.

The difficulties with using this theory are substantial. Not every individual who is a successful problem solver in one aspect of life can easily become a successful teacher. Teaching does require certain skills that are unique to it or that are unique combinations of skills used in other situations. So it seems likely that even if coping theory were a useful way of explaining many of the problems experienced by beginning teachers, it would not explain all of them.

Learning Theory as a Paradigm for the Analysis of the Problems of Beginning Teachers

It is fashionable to use learning theory in one form or another as the paradigm for explaining why teachers have problems when they begin to teach and as a paradigm for developing training programs that presumably would preclude these problems. The Competency-Based Teacher Education Movement is the most salient example of this approach. In this movement it is assumed that effective teaching is a matter of acquiring certain essential competencies. The reasoning goes as follows: effective teachers have certain kinds of skills which are the basis of their effectiveness; if teachers can be taught these skills during their teacher education programs, they will be effective teachers.

This model of how to approach teaching is a sensible model, and it is not germane to expand on the fact that the paradigm had very little substantive and empirical base to support it when it was being most strongly advocated. But in subsequent years research has produced data which show substantial correlations between teaching performances and pupil learning, and therefore provide an empirical basis for this paradigm.

Explanatory Power of the Skill-Learning Paradigm. According to the skill-learning paradigm, beginning teachers have problems because they have not learned the skills they need to be effective. This interpretation led the founders and promotors of the competency-based teacher education movement to conclude that the only way to obviate the problems beginning teachers were having was to reorganize teacher education around training on these skills.

Despite the obvious rationality of this point of view, there has always been a sense of vague dissatisfaction with it except among its most ardent advocates. The reason for this dissatisfaction is that apparently no one has ever seen a fully formed teacher come out of any teacher education program and begin teaching with little or no difficulty. This phenomenon has never been documented although some beginning teachers have relatively little difficulty, have the class under control and have established a direction for instruction within a short period of time. The explanation givin for the large numbers who do have difficulties, however, is that most teachers were not well-trained.

But there seem to be difficulties and problems that require more than the acquisition of certain competencies to resolve. Even when the beginning teacher has acquired the skills, the use of them and the combining and integrating of them into a consistent style remain as problems.

There also seem to be problems related to attitudes and feelings and perceptions for which competence training is not the relevant paradigm, or if it is, no one has demonstrated how it is relevant. It is also a well-known fact that the use of a skill and having the skill are two different matters. Even if a beginning teacher had mastered a large number of relevant skills, that teacher may not use them because of the way he or she perceives the teaching situation or even because of the way the teacher perceives himself or herself. Such characteristics as self-confidence affect one's judgment about how to act in a variety of situations. It would not be surprising that beginning teachers, because they are anxious, would lack confidence and might make mistakes in judgments about how to use the skills they may have.

It does not seem likely, and this is probably the reason for the dissatisfaction with the paradigm, that teacher trainees will simply acquire a set of skills and move into a classroom and be able to manage every situation that arises. Motivational factors, attitudes towards children, feelings about one's self as a competent performer, and decision-making skill ought to affect how skillful and effective one is likely to be.

The answer of the competency-based advocates is that many of these factors are themselves skills and can be acquired by competence training. That projection remains to be demonstrated. It is also not obvious that the paradigm of skill learning can be easily applied to the learning of complex cognitive processes.

Another response to the concern about the breadth of the applicability of this paradigm is that many of the skills to be acquired are the basis for complex attitudes such as attitudes towards one's self. A person will be more "self-confident" if he or she is in fact more skillful; therefore, one view is that the focus of the training should be on the acquisition of the requisite skills and development of other desirable characteristics will follow as a matter of natural course. The evidence does not seem strong to support this point of view, but the contrary evidence admittedly is rather weak.

Research literature does not distinguish between those who have had competency-based training and those who have had some other form of teacher education, therefore we cannot draw a strict conclusion. But among all those who have reported their problems there are certainly many who have had a soundly conceived teacher education program and may have been as well prepared as is possible within the constraints of most teacher education programs. The problems as reported are rarely if ever different if the responses are distinguished by where one was trained, except that apparently those from some institutions have more complaints than those from others.

The learning paradigm, whether it is competency-oriented or not, is however, a useful model for explaining the acquisition of many teaching skills and strategies. If beginning teachers did develop a number of skills to a relatively high degree, and if they could be taught to integrate them and to use them over a sustained period of time, these acquisitions undoubtedly would eliminate some of the problems they have. Also if teacher educators took a more comprehensive look at the kinds of skills required for basic effectiveness and included training for these skills in their programs, we would expect the beginning teacher to have learned many of the things that they have to learn on the job in the first weeks and months.

The problem with this theory is that it is untested. Its explanatory utility also depends heavily upon our understanding of and knowledge about those skills and strategies that are related to effectiveness. We are at the present time only beginning to make progress in our research analysis of these problems and we know relatively little about the most complex forms of skills apparently required for effectiveness, such as those involved in the managing of classes. It has been, for example, clearly established that management tactics and strategies are highly related to effectiveness, but we know practically nothing about the components of these strategies, we have very inadequate descriptions of effective strategies and have had no real experience in training people in them. These difficulties are resolvable. As research probes deeper into the basis of effectiveness, much of the information can be translated into competency training.

The only complete test of the utility of this paradigm can be made when we know many of the components of effectiveness, and have trained some individuals to mastery, and then sent them out to teach. If these individuals experience no problems initially, then we would have discovered the most useful way to approach the preparation of the beginning teacher. But this outcome does not seem likely because of the very real difficulties in analyzing all aspects of teaching in terms of competencies or component skills.

Social Learning Theory as a Paradigm for the Analysis of the Problems of Beginning Teachers

It is still possible to take a learning point of view towards the acquisition of complex competencies that do not lend themselves readily to analysis in terms of the skill paradigm. So it is not necessary to abandon the learning theory notion simply because everything does not easily translate into a competence describable in behavioral terms. A social learning theory was used in an experimentation format conducted at Stanford using the micro-teaching format (McDonald and Allen, 1964). In these experiments teaching interns were exposed to videotapes of models performing a skill.

Social Learning Theory Principles Applied to Teaching. Social learning theory describes variables which facilitate imitating another person's behavior or which stimulate this imitation. The basic principle of the theory is that one person will imitate another person when he sees that person receiving desireable rewards for the observed behavior. The imitation is facilitated when the behavior to be imitated is highlighted or "cued" for the learner. Certain characteristics of the model stimulate imitation.

Social learning theory has been applied directly in teacher training, and as part of one of the successful internship teacher programs, the Stanford program. It is applied, probably unwittingly, every time one teacher watches another and carries away something which the teacher uses in his or her classroom. Demonstrations are another example of the use of social learning theory to teach teachers.

These latter kinds of applications were used in teaching long before social learning theory was developed as a formal learning theory. They were not formal applications of the theory. Rather they were natural occasions for learning from other persons from which social learning theorists learned about the variables and concepts which they tested in the experiments that serve as the foundation of social learning theory.

The Utility of Social Learning Theory in Preparing Teachers for the Transition Period

The value of using social learning theory has been directly demonstrated in a program to prepare teachers for the transition into teaching. In the Stanford Internship Program the interns spend the summer prior to teaching in the schools in the Micro-teaching Clinic where they learn the technical skills of teaching. One method used is a direct application of social learning theory in a training paradigm.

A trainee observes a demonstration in which a teacher uses a technical skill in teaching. The trainee then tries to use this skill in a brief teaching session. This sequence is then repeated. We will analyze the research on this training in the following section. Suffice it to say that the methods were successful.

Did the program prepare the trainees for a successful passage through the transition period? Yes and No. Without this and other training the interns would have faced a transition period without experience of any kind in teaching. That arrangement was tried the first year of the program and abandoned immediately.

But did the skill training facilitate the transition? Although it is highly probable, Stanford never did do the tight, rigorous study which would have detected the specific influences of this training. Did the interns use the skills learned? Most did at some time or another, but we cannot say how critical the skills per se were to mastery of the transition.

But the totality of this training most probably did help mastery of the transition period. The interns invariably reported it as one of the two most valuable parts of their program. This limited teaching experience gave them confidence that they could teach at some level of competence, and perhaps most importantly it gave them the "feel" of teaching.

The use of modeling was one of the most important experimental demonstrations in this program. It has been overlooked in the enthusiasm for micro-teaching and the use of video equipment which were born in this program. Actually the micro-teaching format was a device for conducting the experiments which demonstrated that modeling and feedback variable directly influenced the acquisition of teaching skills. The video-recorder was a convenient and highly efficient device for mediating these variables.

We think that it is important to review this reserch here. It demonstrates first some of what we have learned about direct preparation for teachers for the transition into teaching. The focus of attention is on the modeling variables because what was learned in these experiments demonstrates that social learning theory is highly useful for developing training paradigms.

Note also that these ideas are useful for analyzing and developing induction programs conducted on-the-job for beginning teachers. This research also shows why sitting as a student observing teachers for twelve years is not likely to prepare one for teaching.

A final cautionary note: "observing" as a process in applications of social learning theory is a carefully controlled process. It is not ordinary looking or watching--sitting in another teacher's class or watching a film of teaching procedure may or may not be helpful. Careful applications of social learning principles create the conditions under which observing produces learning.

RESEARCH ON STUDYING THE INFLUENCE OF MODELING ON LEARNING TEACHING SKILLS

The studies conducted by McDonald and Allen from 1962 to 1968 at Stanford used two categories of independent variables; modeling variables and reinforcement variables. Each study used one (or more) dependent variable which was always a teaching skill to be learned, for example, reinforcing pupils' participation in class discussions, probing, various kinds of higher order questions, varying the stimulus situation, and using non-verbal teaching behaviors. In each study teaching interns were randomly assigned to different experimental treatments, each of which was a bona fide training experience. One of these was known to be or believed to be relatively weak, and another was theoretically the most powerful training experience; for example, in one study interns in the "weak" treatment observed video recordings of their own teaching and analyzed its defects or errors without assistance from an instructor, whereas interns in the "strongest" treatment the interns observed their video recordings with an instructor who reinforced them when instances appeared in the recording where they had used the skill on which they were being trained and also made suggestions about other occasions in the teaching episode when they could have used it. This latter condition was a "full" instructional condition, was highly focused, and was adapted to the performance of each trainee in that condition. The weak treatment made learning depend entirely upon the trainee's powers of observation and understanding of what they might have done, as predicted, the strongest treatment and a variation on it were significantly and substantially more effective than the two other conditions.

These studies were experiments which were conducted under two conditions, either in a combination of a laboratory training situation and the interns' classroom situation, or exclusively in a laboratory situation, or exclusively in a classroom situation. The study described in the paragraph above was conducted primarily in the interns' classrooms because video recordings were made of the trainee's classroom performance and used as the instructional material. The application of the instruction was also to occur in the trainee's classroom.

The format of each experimental design consisted in a teaching experience followed by some kind of a training experience, followed by a second teaching experience and another training experience; this sequence being continued through three of four cycles. The first teaching episode was treated as a pretest and the last teaching episode as a posttest.

The training conditions involved various reinforcements or modeling variables or combinations of them. The study described above involved only reinforcement variables. A combination of modeling and reinforcement variables would proceed in the following way: first the trainee taught, then was exposed to a model, then taught again, then viewed his teaching with an instructor who reinforced him or her for appropriate performances; then the cycle began again with the trainee viewing the model tape, followed by teaching, followed by instruction involving reinforcement. These units of modeling, teaching, and reinforcement-instruction were combined in various ways to test the relative power of the different kinds of units and also to identify optimum combinations of such units.

The teaching skill to be learned was one of a broad category called the "Technical Skills of Teaching." These skills were derived from the experience of teachers, by theoretical considerations, or from common sense about what ought to be an effective teaching skill. They were exclusively performance skills. They were largely skills believed necessary to make one an effective high school teacher: for example, many of them were skills involved in conducting class discussions, or in making interactions between the teacher and a high school student more productive, more interesting or more involving. (A parenthetical note: we were concerned with preparing the effective teacher. These skills were among those required to be effective. We thought, therefore, that they were needed in the beginning days of teaching. But they were not selected as the skills necessary to master the transition. Note here the point made earlier in this chapter: The teacher educator takes the long view. Obviously we were also "getting the interns ready for the first day of teaching", but see the conceptual and practical route taken to that goal. Does an intern really need to be asked high-order questions on the first day, or during the first week, or during the first month. Maybe to set the tone of his or her style or to shape expectations. But how critical is such a skill to the immediate and essential goal?)

Each of the training modules--modeling, practice or reinforcement instruction--were relatively brief, usually five to ten minutes in length. Since these experiements were conducted as part of a larger program usually the trainees had to learn in the initial studies how to teach a brief lesson within a five to ten minute period. Once they were able to teach a lesson of this kind, they could then be taught specific skills within the context of teaching such a lesson. The teaching experience was like a five, ten or fifteen minute portion of a lesson. The sessions were lengthened for some kinds of skills as the investigators learned that longer sessions were necessary for the trainee to try the skill.

The methodology described here became known popularly as micro-teaching and has been used extensively in teacher training. Unfortunately some of the original research was lost sight of and the emphasis on the use of micro-teaching was on the value of observing one's self on a video recording.

As we indicated above, these studies used as independent variables various kinds of modeling or reinforcement procedures; for example, trainees were exposed to positive or negative models, that is, models illustrating the behavior to be learned or illustrating the absence of that behavior. Other forms of modeling were used such as symbolic modeling--a written statement of what a teacher is saying or doing was presented to the trainee in the form of a transcript. Such forms of modeling were contrasted with visual and auditory modeling as portrayed on videotape. Modeling tapes were carefully constructed; the model was rehearsed on the specific skill to be demonstrated until the model performed that skill frequently in the course of a five to ten minute recording. This basic presentation was also varied by combining it with reinforcement modules. Reinforcement conditions were similarly varied, some of the variations being positive and negative reinforcement, or variations in the frequency of the reinforcement given during a training session.

We have described these studies in some detail because they demonstrate a major point, namely that this methodology was highly effective for training individuals in specific skills that they needed for teaching. But micro-teaching alone, particularly when limited to a format in which the trainee learns skills one at a time successively, is not a guarantor that the skills will be used in the classroom or that the trainee will combine the various skills into an effective teaching style.

Results of modeling and reinforcent studies. Two major conclusions were derived from these studies. Both modeling and reinforcement conditions generally were very effective for training on the acquisition of a specific skill. This methodology was effective. But there were variations in the methodology which were not particularly effective. Reinforcement was most useful when it was administered by another person (in contrast to some form of self-administration), when it was in the form of corrective feedback, and when instruction was added that carried the trainee beyond what he or she had already done in the classroom or in the training session. Negative modeling conditions, while generally humorous, had practically no detectable effect on learning, a conclusion not entirely surprising when one considers the literature on concept formation which strongly indicates that learning from negative examples is very difficult.

One of the more interesting results of these studies was the relationship between the effectiveness of the methodology and the type of skill being learned. In almost all of these studies the trainee taught a lesson of their own choice, they did not teach the same lesson as the model when they were observing a model. They chose the topic and the objectives and the teaching methodology. The only requirement was that they had to use the skill that they were learning, which in some cases required them to use a specific methodology; for example, to use a class discussion rather than a lecture to cover an aspect of a topic. The trainees therefore were usually learning a *class of behaviors or performances* rather than a specific response; a class, for example, is "probing questions." The trainee learned the general character or morphology of this category of responses but had to supply the content of the performance.

Because the trainee was learning a category, obviously the trainee had to do a certain amount of work beyond that required by simple imitation. The trainee had to take the idea of a probing question from what he or she could observe in the model tape and apply it to the specific teaching occasions in which the trainee was involved. The process was not simply one of generalizing from one situation to another. The use of the skill required the application of what was learned by watching a model to a particular new context in which the trainee generated an approximation or a reproduction of the model's performance.

Note this point. Almost all uses of observing another teacher, whatever the media of portrayal, has this feature. Obviously the greater the gap between the situation observed and the situation where the application is to occur, the greater the demand on the observor to think through the relevance and applicability of what he or she is observing.

Most of the problems we experienced with this methodology were related to the nature of the teaching skill being learned. The more heavily the skill depended upon cognitive processes to develop an application, the less likely the trainees were to learn from the modeling without additional interventions. In one study a strict imitation condition was used. The trainee taught exactly the same lesson as the model; hence, there was no need to apply in a new context what had been observed in another context. A very high degree of imitation occurred. In the same study, however, other trainees had to apply what they had observed in the model tape to their own lessons, and in these conditions the imitation or learning was not as great as it was in the condition where the trainees taught exactly the same lesson as the model. This result corresponds with the results generally obtained in other social learning experiments.

These technical details illustrate a basic problem in learning to teach. The teacher usually is teaching in a different situation than the one he or she observes, and therefore must adapt whatever has been observed to his or her own teaching situation. Some of the difficulties of learning from others are directly traceable to the difficulties of applying what has been seen or heard in one situation to a problem in one's own teaching.

One of the more interesting conclusions in the series of studies being described here, and one which unfortunately has been given scant attention, is derived from a study which conclusively demonstrated that modeling conditions were effective with or without a reinforcing condition. This result was not surprising because it corresponded to the general conclusion of social learning theory which is that modeling is very effective for initial acquisition of a skill or behavior, but reinforcement is necessary for its maintenance over time. In this particular study the skill to be learned was asking "evaluative questions." The model demonstrated such questions and two different conditions of presenting this model were used: in one condition the trainee simply observed the video recording; in the other condition, an instructor was present with the trainee and pointed out each time an evaluative question was asked by the model. Of these two conditions the second was much more effective.

Added to each of these conditions was either a reinforcement module or no reinforcement was provided. In the analysis of the results, the main effect from modeling was highly significant and none of the interaction effects were similarly significant. The only conclusion that could be drawn was that when modeling was present the behavior was most likely to be learned whether or not reinforcement was used.

This study illustrates the power of observing a model who demonstrates a complex teaching behavior. It is important, however, to point out that for all trainees the performance training was preceded by instruction on the nature of evaluation questions and practice in constructing them. In this way training was given on two aspects of the skill, the cognitive component and the performance component.

This study illustrates what are probably the basic or required conditions for learning from a model or a demonstration teaching. One needs training on the cognitive aspects of the performance as an integral part of the total training. One also needs to be cued on how the performance is being carried out.

Up to this point we have not pointed out a significant factor in this kind of learning which is that a video recording of a teaching episode shows many different behaviors of a teacher. The verbal behavior alone is complex and added to that are psychomotor behaviors of other kinds, the responses of students, and the appearance of the physical environment in which the teaching is occurring. The stimulus presented to the trainee is a relatively rich stimulus, and the observer has to sort out that aspect of it to which he or she must give their full attention.

The instructor present during the modeling sessions in this experiment noted when the evaluation questions were to occur. As we pointed out above, this training condition was the most effective. Other forms of cueing could be used, and it is a technical problem to find out which forms of cueing are effective and practical. The critical point is that when the model performance is complex some form of cueing is essential.

We have spent considerable time on the modeling and reinforcement experimentation because these were carefully controlled studies of variables that appear in other kinds of training experiences. Teachers do have the opportunity occasionally to observe a demonstration lesson or to watch another teacher. The value of such observation will be directly related to the clarity of the observer's perception of what is to be learned, which depends in part upon how sharply it is demonstrated and in part upon directing the observer's attention to what is to be learned. This is an important concept also to keep in mind when using any of the wide variety of video recordings of teaching performances now available.

What we believe this line of research amply illustrates is that many significant skills of teaching can be learned by instructional strategies or technologies that use modeling and reinforcement variables. Social learning theory (and reinforcement theory) provide basic principles for constructing technologies for teaching the beginning teacher some of the skills which he or she needs.

Problems in using social learning theory. There are several problems in applying social learning theory or reinforcement theory to teaching the beginning teacher the skills needed to master the transition period. The first problem is the perennial problem, what are the skills to be taught. The trainees in the research discussed were to be high school teachers. Those who were recent graduates from college tended to teach like their college instructors, that is, to lecture at length, and therefore make difficulties for themselves. It is not difficult to visualize what would happen in an English class or a social studies class in a high school where a beginning teacher conducts it as if it were a college classroom. Management problems are highly likely to occur. Therefore the technical skills of teaching which these trainees were taught were those needed to use other teaching methodologies or strategies. These technical skills may not be the most essential ones for the first days or weeks of teaching, but planning and organizing are apparently important in the beginning. No one has applied social learning principles to learning skills required for these activities. Some may think that it is not possible; but some applications are readily thought of. But one does not have to be fetishistic about applying a particular theory. Other approaches may be more sound or practical.

We did attempt to develop training for management skills which are agreed to be essential for beginning teaching. There are, however, technological and psychological difficulties in this kind of specific training. It is not always easy to construct an appropriate technology for learning certain kinds of skills. We had repeated difficulties with teaching these management or "discipline" skills.

One of the reasons why it was difficult to teach them was that the experimental occasion was traumatic for the trainees and the negative reaction to the training was overwhelming. The other difficulty was controlling the technology so that it would work effectively, a problem which was eventually solved. But probably the most significant problem for this specific kind of training was that it ignored what is the critical factor when a teacher has management problems, namely that the teacher creates these problems himself or herself.

In the technology used to train people on management skills, students in the micro-teaching class created management problems. This type of constructed situation was not unrealistic because students in "real life" do autonomously generate problems, and therefore the training had value for that sub-class of management problems. But since many management problems appear to be generated by the way the teacher approaches topics--failure to give specific directions, poor pacing, lack of routines for carrying out basic tasks such as taking attendance--the trainee could practice only aspects of the management problem, and these were perhaps not the most critical aspects.

It may be possible to use this kind of training technology to generate situations in which the teacher creates his or her own management problems, but as we construct such a technology we are coming closer and closer to real teaching. Certain kinds of management problems occur because the teacher is in the classroom day after day and has developed a style for organizing instruction and relating to pupils. It is these general characteristics of teaching which cause problems rather than specific behaviors in which the teacher may engage periodically. At least that seems to be the most sensible view to take until we have more precise and detailed knowledge about management problems.

This kind of research can identify those aspects of teaching where on-the-job assistance is necessary. Aspects of learning management skills seems to be one example. In a larger program of research and development, training institutions could take on specific training problems. If they can find ways to train so that beginning teachers do not have certain problems which are now pervasive in their experience. If a successful preparatory solution cannot be developed, then assistance on-the-job, learning while teaching, is necessary. Then we should find the best ways to provide that assistance.

Other aspects of learning to teach are difficult to practice in micro-teaching or other simulation formats, because they require extended teaching experiences. Organizing instruction over time requires regular teaching in a designed curriculum. It is possible to construct a simulation situation like this, but then the question becomes whether it is not more efficient or more effective simply to use regular teaching as a training experience.

Simulation or Real Teaching?

The largest problem is to identify what can be learned through modeling and reinforcement techniques. The studies cited above and other studies demonstrate that some classes of behavior can be learned in simulated situations in which these variables are interposed. These same variables can be interposed to some degree in real teaching situations; for example, a supervising instructor can go into a trainee's classroom and demonstrate how to perform, and most supervisors give some form of corrective feedback and reinforcement after observing a trainee. Most of the problems in using modeling and reinforcement variables in real teaching derive from the poor technology of instruction which is used rather than from the complexities of the situation. Supervisors, for example, who do not provide corrective feedback cannot blame their lack of effectiveness on the complexity of the teaching situation.

A critical point which needs study is the point at which the skill or the performance or the strategy to be learned requires involvement in a real situation. It appears that some aspects of learning to teach may have to be learned by actually teaching. As we point out repeatedly, this problem is unstudied. We do not know what aspects of teaching can be learned only by experience in the real situation. We suspect on the basis of our research that where performances, or styles, or strategies are extended in time, or where processes are carried on over time or involve successive episodes, or where the results, effects or what happens depend heavily on the response of students, that learning is likely to be most effective when done under real conditions or may be possible only in real conditions.

Can Cognitive Processes Be Modeled?

The other aspect of learning to teach which is not easily describable as a social learning phenomena are certain cognitive tasks such as planning and instruction. The problem of modeling cognitive process is a general problem because it occurs internally, and before modeling can be done effectively that internal process must be made observable. But internal processes are revealed in a variety of ways, one of the most obvious being in the form of a product such as written statements. A teacher's lesson plans are an example, though such documents frequently reflect only a very small portion of the thinking behind them. If we are talking about "real lesson plans", the observable product may be something that has been put together to meet the requirements of an administrator and may reflect very little of the teacher's thinking. The task of revealing cognitive process is not insuperable. But we do not have any useful models of these processes nor have we developed a technology for using them if we had them.

Much of what we learn about how another person thinks, we learn either by inferring from what the person does or says or by an extended dialogue with the person. Such ways of learning are available to the teachers; for example, a beginning teacher can sit down and be instructed by an experienced teacher on how to plan, and this instruction will usually be a step-by-step demonstration of how to think through the organization of content or instructional process. At present we can only speculate that such instruction would be effective. It would be an application of the concepts of social learning theory to the problem of learning certain kinds of cognitive processes.

But as we consider how more complicated processing skills are learned, it becomes more difficult to see how a teacher can learn simply by observing another teacher. We do not think it is impossible, but considerable experimental and technological work will have to be done in order to develop effective systems for training. It is possible at the present time to have a teacher talk about what he or she was thinking about while the teacher and a second or third person watch a videotape of the teacher's teaching. This technique in various other applications has been called "stimulated recall" because usually one of the persons present will ask prompting questions. But this methodology has been used mainly to find out what teachers are thinking about, and has not been adapted to training somebody to learn how to think about certain kinds of teaching problems.

Those aspects of teaching which are primarily cognitive in character are learned at the present time mainly by very traditional forms of instruction, principally by reading and listening to lectures. Some learning probably occurs by talking to teachers. But we do not understand enough about how these cognitive processes are learned nor do we understand enough about what are effective ways of thinking. The consequence is that important aspects of teaching are not under "instructional control."

It may be that some of the major problems of beginning teachers occur simply because we have not developed adequate ways of training them to think about these problems. Planning seems to be an obvious example. Equally important and perhaps more interesting examples are the kind of thinking required to raise the level of instruction from simple didactic instruction to heuristic instruction, to problem-solving, to inquiry, and to the near-reaches of creative thinking. The issues about learning in these latter cases, however, are complicated in many ways. Should such complex teaching strategies and skills be learned before actually beginning to teach?

In summary we can make a stronger statement about the value of using social learning concepts both to study the problems of beginning teachers and to figure out ways of helping them than we could for coping theory. A basic problem remains in both cases, namely, what are the critical skills or performances or strategies that need to be learned. But this particular theory as well as reinforcement theory supply a framework for instructional systems which are likely to make much more precise the learning of the beginning teacher than copying theory. From this perspective it seems that what we need to do is to identify certain critical skills which are essential for mastering the transition period and then create the training situations in the preservice period which will teach individuals these skills.

As we shall see in a later discussion some of the internship programs, where the ideas associated with micro-teaching have found a home, this kind of training is successfully done. At Temple University, for example, interns receive intensive simulated and real training during a summer session. These interns report this experience as the most beneficial experience in their training. The training focuses on basic skills required for effective instruction, primarily management and organization. This successful demonstration illustrates the possibility for utilizing both simulated and real training under carefully controlled conditions which apply these principles.

LEARNING FROM OTHER TEACHERS

In the broad sense, learning from other teachers is an application of social learning theory. It has always been recommended as part of preservice training but has not been too successful. It is a central concept in induction programs. It is the central idea of the arguments for teacher centers and is the basis for the uniqueness of their programs.

Would a beginning teacher have fewer problems if he or she spent more time studying experienced teachers? Or if experienced teachers were available as monitors and mentors as he or she began to teach? The research using social learning theory principles provides a foundation for extrapolating beyond the confines of preservice and simulated training experiences.

Many teacher preparation programs include observation experiences. Some of these are in the form of courses in which the trainee spends a considerable amount of time during a quarter or semester of instruction in classrooms observing teachers. Other observation experiences are attached to courses in educational psychology or methodology.

The value of these observations depends on how well the principles of social learning theory have been applied in constructing this instructional experience. If the trainee observes without specific directions on what to look for, he or she is likely to observe those things which are of greatest personal interest, but which may or may not be relevant to acquiring effective teaching skills. If the model does not demonstrate effective teaching skills but rather mediocre practices, what the trainee is likely to learn are practices that are minimally effective for stimulating, improving and enhancing pupils' learning. Two conditions therefore are necessary: 1) the teacher observed must be a model of some aspects of effective teaching; 2) the observer must be cued to look for those practices which are effective and which are most likely to be useful to the beginning teacher.

Some of the problems of beginning teachers are linked to critical events in the course of the school year. One of these is the opening of school. Effective teachers usually establish management routines from the first day of class and follow through to make sure that these management routines are carried out by the pupils. The effective manager of classes sets the rules, whatever their character, even if the rule is that one must make his or her own decisions about how one ought to act in class, early in the first week of school. The style, the tone of the class is quickly established; the management routines are spelled out; students' responsibilities are clearly indicated, and expectations for student performance and what they may expect from the teacher are also established as rapidly as is feasible. Part of the success of the effective manager of a class depends on his or her skill in establishing a management system from the first day of the school year. The beginning teacher or the trainee who is to learn from observing an experienced teacher must be present to observe these events and know what events to observe.

The condition stipulated of knowing what to look for is easily established. The trainee's instructor can accompany the trainee on some observation sessions and point out those things that are necessary for him or her to learn. Conferences can be held before observations about what to look for. The observer can discuss with the teacher of the class how that teacher proposes to conduct the class. An interview with the teacher after class can be used to clarify what the teacher is doing and why and to discuss potential problems or possibilities that have not emerged as yet. In these ways the observer can become cognitively immersed in what is happening in the class and why it is happening.

The other condition of linking observations to critical events in the school year is also easily satisfied, with possibly a few exceptions. The trainees can be placed in classes right from the beginning of school, even if such arrangements require them to begin their professional training before the academic year has actually begun--the teachers, however, may be reluctant to allow observers into the classroom on the first few days and until they feel they have established the routine and have gained control over the events in the classroom. Perhaps the appropriate model for the relationship of the observing trainee to the experienced teacher is that of the apprentice. The observer is present as the teacher carries out the functions of teaching, and talks to the teacher about the teacher's activities.

Despite a widespread belief among those who train teachers and among experienced teachers that one learns to teach by doing, it is highly likely that much of the learning required to be at least minimally competent can be accomplished by watching an experienced teacher. It may very well be that far more than that which is required for minimal competence can be learned by observing appropriate models.

Teacher education programs have not always managed these observations well. The essential conditions for learning most effectively from observations are not always met. Toe frequently accommodations are made to the trainee's academic schedule or calendar, the supervising instructors at the college are not sufficiently familiar with teachers in the school to know who will be the most appropriate or best models, discussions between the supervising instructor at the college and the trainee are relatively infrequent and separated in time from the actual moment of observation. The trainee is occasionally sent in to observe more as a critic than as a learner; or the observer's expectations are unrealistic, and he or she becomes a critic when the teacher does not do those things that the trainees have been taught are the "best" practices.

These conditions are easily removed and those conditions which are necessary for learning from observing can be established by careful evaluation of experienced teachers and by administering the necessary conditions artfully and rigorously. Observational learning can be highly effective. In practical experience and in the experimental literature trainees learn directly and immediately by observing. They do not usually have to go through long periods of trial and error in applying what they have observed, nor do they have to practice repeatedly what is to be observed--there are exceptions to this, as when this skill is being applied in a much different situation than the one in which it was observed, or where the skill requires considerable judgment and decision-making to which the trainee can bring only limited experience at best. Therefore, when trainees do not learn easily and quickly from observing, one must look to the system for observing as the likely source of the causes of failure.

If beginning teachers are having so much difficulty mastering the transition to teaching, one cannot help but suspect that they have had very limited opportunities and apparently not very effective opportunities observe teachers who have mastered these same problems. Each teacher has to establish "control" over a class at the beginning of the academic year and has to establish management routines; if he or she does not, they have a management problem. Therefore there are teachers available to be observed who have effective ways of dealing with these problems which are so threatening to beginning teachers, about which they are highly anxious, and for which they repeatedly say they have not been adequately prepared.

It may be that the emphasis in the last decade or two on practice in teacher education programs has led us to overlook the value of observational learning. When practice is simply trial and error, it is not likely to be very effective and may in fact be harmful. Learning by observing should teach the beginning teacher as much about what he or she needs to know about effective teaching before they actually begin any practice. The practice then is more likely to be useful, less random, and be less dependent on learning from mistakes.

DEMONSTRATIONS

One form of teaching teachers new or better ways to teach, not commonly used, is to conduct a demonstration in which an experienced teacher shows how he or she teaches when using a particular strategy or skill. If the necessary conditions for making observational learning effective are met, teachers ought to learn the new strategy or skill relatively easily from observing another teacher performing it. Such strategies are becoming common in teacher centers and are central features of on-the-job induction programs.

These conditions are the same as those previously discussed for any form of observational learning: 1) the demonstrator must be highly competent at what is being shown or modeled; and 2) the observer must know exactly what to watch or to look for.

Too frequently demonstrations are explained only superficially in advance. The questions asked after a demonstration are usually a key to how much learning has taken place. Many times these questions are philosophical questions about the "oughts" of performing the strategy, or descriptions of how the observer does the same thing in a different way, or frequently the observers complain about the difficulties they would have "in their school" doing what they have just seen. It is obvious from this type of discourse that the observer's mind is more on other problems than it is on the specifics of what is to be done.

These concerns are real and need to be attended to. Perhaps they should be attended to before the demonstration; perhaps the demonstrator ought to talk about these problems, and how he or she has solved them before actually conducting the demonstration.

But one problem that is not likely to be solved easily by observing a demonstration is the application of what has been learned to the teacher's classroom where the conditions are very different. If the teacher has to think through the application of what has been observed to a substantially different teaching situation, that teacher probably will need help in making the application. If the demonstration can be used without additional preparation or other kinds of training, then the observers ought to be able to take what they observe and use it almost immediately. When this does not happen, either the observers had no more motivation than to come to the demonstration to see what happens, or the demonstration was poorly organized from an instructional point of view.

The research literature and practical experience is so clear and so consistent in showing that people learn quickly and easily from observing, that the failure of beginning teachers to master transition problems means certainly that they have had either no, little, or poor experience in observing individuals who have mastered these problems. It is useful to consider having an experienced and effective teacher demonstrates what a beginning teacher must learn to do. If the beginning teacher cannot do these things, they can learn how to do them by watching someone who can do them.

APPLICATION OF SOCIAL LEARNING THEORY TO THE PROBLEMS OF BEGINNING TEACHERS

We have been suggesting how social learning theory can be used to construct instructional strategies from which beginning teachers either in the preparation program or within the first year of teaching can learn to be more effective. What is required either during training or during the first year is the opportunity to observe effective teachers under the carefully controlled conditions which we have specified above. A beginning teacher during his or her first year can be given the opportunity to watch other teachers, but if the beginner does not discuss what he or she has observed, has not prepared himself or herself for the observation, not very much is likely to be learned from the observation.

The observer's attention must be focused on what is to be learned. Although much learning occurs without another person directing the observer's attention, when one wants to use observational learning as the mode of instruction, then the only sensible procedure is to make sure that the observer knows exactly what to observe.

As we have said above we think that systems of observational learning built into the training period and perhaps into the first year of teaching would provide the type of instruction necessary to help the beginning teachers solve many of their problems. The difficulties are more administrative or practical in character than they are conceptual. Another problem may be that individuals regard observational learning as a weak or illegitimate form of learning--observational learning has not been held in high esteem until recent years among psychologists and educators.

Perhaps a word should be said here about the relative values of observing live or video recordings. This problem is essentially unstudied. However, we offer the following conclusions based on our own experience and what we have heard from other individuals. The video recorder is a limited eye, what one sees depends on what the camera operator has chosen to aim the camera at. Nor is the videotape recorder a very good ear unless an elaborate recording system is constructed. (We ignore here the waste that can occur if one simply videotapes unrehearsed teaching sessions.)

The video camera does not do the observer's work. What is to be observed can be focused on sharply by the use of the camera, but someone has to think about what to look at. Naturalistic situations are interesting on video tape but they can be unbelievably boring and large segments of the tape may simply be useless for instruction.

The problem with live observations is that there are many distractions in the classroom. There are numerous stimuli only some of which the observer should be attending to if the observer is to learn from the teacher. The camera therefore has the advantage, if carefully used, of directing and focusing attention. It is an editorial device, and if used as such can focus attention on those events which the trainee might very well miss if they were in a real classroom.

On the other hand the live situation shows the trainee how the events to which the trainee is to attend are connected to other kinds of events and activities. The trainee also sees the context in which the actions of interest are occurring.

Obviously one does not have to choose live observations over video recording observations. Both may be used, and probably an effective instructional system would use video recordings to focus learning quickly and efficiently, and then take the trainee into the classroom where he or she can see the specific skills that were demonstrated on videotape in a larger context.

The technology of observational learning is relatively easy to create, whether for live situations or video recordings, and whether the content is simulated or a recording of a real event. We know conditions necessary to build an effective instructional system using observational learning. Most of our problems are practical and administrative rather than technical or conceptual.

But some problems are not automatically solved by using observational learning strategies. The problem of using what has been learned persists no matter what the form of the observational learning. The problem of maintaining the use of the learned skill is a problem no matter how that skill may have been learned--by descriptive lecturing, by video recordings, by live observations, by practicing and learning from trial and error, or by corrective feedback.

The problem of use and the maintenance of skill is a different problem than the problem of acquiring the skill. Social learning theory has clearly been substantiated by experimental work and by practical experience and from this combination of theory and experience one can conclude that the acquisition phase of learning is greatly facilitated by observational learning. A general principle is that the necessary learning occurs much more quickly by observational learning than by other instructional strategies, for example, applying reinforcement theory, but the maintenance of what is learned is achieved by reinforcement and instruction applied to the use of a skill over time.

We repeat here what we have said directly and by implication in a number of places in this section. It is difficult to see why beginning teachers say they know so little about how to conduct instruction effectively when there are so many effective teachers from whom they could learn. Efficiency and economy of learning strongly suggests that teacher preparation programs or beginning teacher induction programs ought to work seriously on developing systems of observational learning along the lines that we have been suggesting in this section.

It must be apparent to the reader that among learning theories we lean to social learning theory as probably one of the best sources of ideas for constructing practical and effective instructional systems for preparing the beginning teacher. The reason for this, is not that we think that reinforcement theory is weak, but that it is difficult to apply broadly and comprehensively as the primary basis of an instructional system of teacher preparation. Great progress has been made in applying reinforcement theory to a variety of practical problems in teaching.

Corrective feedback sessions are essential for learning how to teach well. But as a basis for rapid acquisition of skills, reinforement theory is more likely to produce cumbersome applications.

TO HELP BEGINNING TEACHERS: COPING THEORY OR LEARNING THEORY

To this point we have considered two different kinds of learning theory. We do not think it profitable to go into other variations on learning theory because the practical applications will not be radically different. We believe that either form of learning theory, or learning theory in general, is a more practical conceptual base for designing teacher preparation programs than theories of coping. As we said in the section on coping theory, to cope presupposes the acquisition of certain skills which are generalized to new situations. The coping theory might very well account for how the beginning teacher generalizes what he or she has learned to new situations, or to teaching in succeeding years. In fact we have used the theory in precisely that way at an earlier point.

We have suggested, and we will discuss this point at greater length in the next chapter, that beginning teachers tend to continue to use what they found "effective" during their transition into teaching. Such generalizing beyond the original learning situation is coping behavior, but as is obvious, one copes when one has already learned skills with which to cope.

Therefore in the design of programs to help the beginning teacher we might consider learning theory, specifically social learning theory and reinforcement theory, as appropriate paradigms for constructing some of the instructional strategies needed to be an effective teacher. Coping theory is likely to be useful as a conceptual base when we need to think about how to help teachers meet different situations for which we cannot provide specific instruction.

But there are other aspects of becoming an effective teacher which do not seem to be explainable by either of these kinds of theories and for which these theories do not provide an obviously appropriate base for designing instructional systems. We turn now first to cognitive theory and then to developmental theory in order to find a base for studying these other problems.

COGNITIVE THEORY AND THE PROBLEMS OF BEGINNING TEACHERS

Cognitive theory covers many different kinds of specific theories with certain generic characteristics in common. Some of these theories are information processing theories, others are perceptual-cognitive theories, some are elaborate descriptions of rational thinking. The cognitive psychologist generally takes the position that one cannot account for observable behavior simply by noting the conditions of reinforcement under which the behavior was learned or that prevail at the time one observes the behavior; nor can one account for many forms of behavior simply by saying that one has learned them from other people. This fact seems to be indisputable and is usually responded to by strenuous efforts on the part of learning theorists to demonstrate that in fact one can account for anything and everything that one observes by a particular learning theory. B. F. Skinner has demonstrated this point better than anyone else; he has attempted to apply his form of reinforcement theory to a very wide range of human problems, and so have his followers.

But there are domains of human experience which Skinner obviously avoids, a point that he himself readily admits. As he has said, on methodological grounds it is impossible from his point of view to study certain kinds of human actions, namely those which are not directly or immediately observable such as thinking and feeling responses. But these issues are of interest primarily to those whose lives are concerned with theory building, although educators frequently get caught up in advocacy of a theory or opposition to a theoretical point of view.

Practically speaking we know that human beings think that their thinking processes guide their actions, that they make decisions, that the quality of these decisions strongly influences their actions, and that observable actions can be explained by the cognitions that preceded and accompanied these actions. We rely for substantiation of this point largely on the experiences of individuals and some experimental work.

We have, however, very little data on teachers' thinking processes. Studies in this area are only now being undertaken, and the initial results are not at all promising, perhaps because in these early stages the development of effective methodological procedures is the paramount task.

The important point here is to ask the question, what does a teacher need to think about in order to be an effective teacher? There are some obvious answers to this question. The thinking processes are involved in analyzing the tasks of teaching, in planning these tasks, and in evaluating the effects of one's instruction. Evaluation and planning are the most obvious examples of how cognitive process is involved in teaching.

A teacher needs to plan in several respects. Perhaps the most obvious is that the teacher must plan the objectives of instruction. The teacher has a limited number of these objectives which he or she can actually plan within the context of larger objectives set by the school system. But there are areas of the curriculum where the teacher has much greater freedom to specify objectives. More importantly perhaps, the teacher must plan the objectives of instruction for the day or the period.

The teacher must plan the instructional tasks that will help the students achieve the objective. These instructional tasks are combinations of content or materials to be worked on and activities in which to be engaged. One could create a humorous essay by trying to explain how reinforcement theory explained how a teacher planned a lesson. On the other hand cognitive theory might not do a very good job of offering an explanation either, but at least cognitive theory would seem more relevant to giving an explanation.

We are confronted here with trying to conceptualize how to teach people certain kinds of cognitive tasks without very much knowledge about the cognition involved in these tasks and without much knowledge about how to teach somebody to think in those ways if we knew what they were. There have been some studies on planning, but they have produced nothing in the way of significant scientific or practical results.

Attempting to apply cognitive theory does direct our attention to tasks of teaching for which the appropriate activity is sitting and thinking about those activities. In teacher training and inservice programs these aspects of teaching are frequently taught in the most traditional ways. The most traditional way is for an instructor to lecture about the process of planning or evaluating; for example, evaluation courses or units present the principle methods of measurement and ways in which they may be used, how to interpret data derived from these methods of measurement, how to develop grades, how to relate measurement to instruction, and similar matters.

The information presented is practical if it were used by teachers, and if used, would certainly improve the quality of their evaluations of their pupils. But the same course with the examples changed could be given to anyone who has to measure some aspect of human performance; much of the content could be learned by personnel managers or supervisors rating employees. The course is essentially on the basic principles and techniques of measurement as applied to a part of educational evaluation.

This knowledge is necessary in order to think about evaluation while teaching. But such courses as they are usually taught do not teach the teacher how to think about evaluation. One of the teachers' most important problems is an attitudinal problem--the teacher's attitude towards the process of evaluation itself. Another important aspect of evaluation are the informal rules and guidelines by which it operates in a particular school; the principal may disapprove of "too many" low grades; the department chairman may want the grades distributed by level of difficulty of the various classes in the department; there may be a "feeling" that bright students should be graded by comparison with each other so that some bright students taking difficult classes will receive lower grades than students taking easier classes.

The teacher evaluates in a social-political context in which he or she must relate the process of evaluation to the feelings and reactions of the pupils themselves, their parents and fellow teachers who may be evaluating and grading the same pupils. This social-political matrix is more like a maze for beginning teachers who do not know what these rules are or even that they exist.

They find that they must meet deadlines for turning in grades and reports which makes it difficult for them to use more sophisticated evaluation procedures if they have not learned how to use them efficiently. They find that no one really worries about the reliability or validity of their tests, a point likely to have been stressed by their instructors. They must account, if at all, for the pattern of grades they give, the response to which is largely highly personalistic or political.

The question to be asked here is how does the teacher meld useful and solid evaluation practices with an understanding of the context in which evaluation is being done. A way of thinking is obviously required that is a mixture of applying principles and techniques positively, administering a system fairly, having the wisdom and the courage to present and defend this system, and to be able to respond to those who are likely to criticize the evaluation.

The change required in going from a student to a beginning teacher to an experienced teacher is a change from being evaluated to being an evaluator; this change requires a change of perspective, in attitudes and in ways of thinking about the practical social problems of evaluation as well as the principles and techniques of measurement.

In this example we can see the different kinds of cognitive processes which are likely to influence how a teacher teaches. First of all, the teacher must be clear about purpose and objectives and goals within the context of a limited choice of these purposes and objectives and goals. Second, the teacher must be able to conceptualize the consequences of carrying out any process, whether it be planning, instruction, or evaluation. Third, in addition to anticipating these consequences the teacher must be able to cope with them. Some of these consequences will be undesirable and very disagreeable; some of the consequences will be attacks on the teacher's integrity or competence; some of the consequences will be a realization that what the teacher has tried did not work very well, and the teacher will need to rethink the process.

These aspects of teaching, these ways of thinking about the integral processes of teaching pervade every instructional act from the time the teacher begins the school year through the school year, from the beginning of the school day to well beyond its end. Even if the teacher is not a very competent teacher, he or she is thinking at some level, in some way about the processes of teaching and how they will be carried out and what their results will be for the pupils and for himself or herself.

These aspects of cognition are barely studied. Many of the items of cognition listed above have been picked up in talks with teachers, but there is very little formal study of the processes of perception and cognition on a task-by-task, day-by-day basis. We know something about teachers' attitudes towards instruction and something about their satisfaction with their jobs. We know they feel vulnerable to attacks from the outside, unappreciated and devalued. But many of these surveys of teachers' attitudes are conducted in an essentially political context and are gathered by their representative organizations which use them to make important and necessary political points. But such data are probably biased in some ways, and are usually incomplete in the sense that they are limited to gathering information on those aspects of teachers' attitudes which are likely to have political usefulness.

We have no studies in which teachers are followed through a planning process in a systematic way so that we can describe the morphologies of these processes; similarly we lack information on how teachers think about the evaluative process.

The repeated statements by beginning teachers that their teacher preparation programs did not in fact prepare them for teaching could be thought of as a description of two kinds of problems: (1) that they were not trained on specific skills or strategies or teaching performances which they needed; or (2) that they were not mentally prepared for the tasks of teaching.

The more usual interpretation of their problems or complaints focuses on the first of these explanations. The consequence of making this interpretation of the complaint is usually to urge more specific training on teaching skills, more practical training, and more direct classroom experience. But imbedded in these descriptions by beginning teachers' problems are a sufficient number of statements to suggest strongly that the second kind of difficulty is equally important to the beginning teacher. The beginning teacher does not know how to plan, for example; this task is clearly one requiring learning how to think about the planning of instructional events. Beginning teachers complain about not being able to evaluate effectively or efficiently. This complaint may have its basis in a lack of information on evaluation process, but it is equally likely that it is a reflection of the social-political problems as well as the technical problems with which the beginning teacher is confronted.

There are some obvious ways, a few of which are being tried, of studying how teachers think about the processes of teaching. Among these are interviewing teachers comprehensively and thoroughly as they plan instruction or evaluation. The research methodology to be used should be very similar to that used in the classical studies of problem solving where the persons being studied worked the problem out-loud, giving the steps in their thinking, their wanderings through the paths of the problem, and their reorganization of their ideas as they proceeded. Such studies reveal the mental processes being used by the problem solvers. In a similar way we could study the mental processes used by teachers as they organize their thinking for the significant tasks of teaching.

This kind of thinking process should be contrasted with the thinking which is actually done in the classroom as the teacher conducts instruction. Some studies of this kind have been made but they have not been particularly productive at this point, largely because the investigators, for good reasons, are exploring how to examine teachers' thinking as they teach. It may be that the mental processes used to organize and evaluate instruction are quite different from those which are used as one carries out the task; in fact, it seems likely that they would be.

But until we know more about the cognitive processes involved in the organizing of instruction and those used in the conduct of instruction, and until we compare and contrast these processes, we have very little basis for developing, using and applying cognitive theory to explain why teachers have certain kinds of problems as they begin to teach.

The problem here is to develop a data base so that theory can be used intelligently. It has too frequently been the case in the study of teaching that psychological theories are applied to the teaching process when the theorizer has little empirical evidence for the appropriateness or the utility of the application of the theory. Reinforcement theory has been applied for years to classroom activities with little evidence that the processes of reinforcement were used in a systematic way by teachers or could be.

Similarly, "higher-order questions" were advocated on the grounds that such questions would stimulate more complex forms of thinking on the part of the pupils. The empirical aspects of this problem were unstudied; very little was known about how pupils were thinking in class or could be stimulated to think; nor was the process of systematic use of higher-order questions studied, with one exception, so that a description and a theory of cognitive process in the classroom could be developed. Hilda Taba is the exception referred to; interestingly, in her work she found great difficulty in training teachers to move up the cognitive ladder, and when they did pupils may not have responded appropriately. Taba's work illustrates in part the difficulty of conducting a complex cognitive process in an interactive situation where many individuals are involved. In such cases cognitive theory appears to be the worse for wear because the theory does not predict what is going to happen nor does it explain what does happen.

The problem is that the investigator, fond of or devoted to a particular theoretical stance, proclaims its utility and advocates its application, leaving unstudied how the theory fits observable data. We think that this mistake must be avoided if we are to use cognitive theory to account for the problems of beginning teachers. We are suggesting that a careful empirical study of how teachers think as they teach, relating differences among teachers to criteria of effectiveness, is a first step in developing a model or theory which will account for the difficulties some beginning teachers have during the transition period into teaching and will also explain why some teachers are more effective and efficient than others.

Our position is that the nature of the problems of beginning teachers are such that it seems likely that cognitive theory will be useful in explaining why some of these problems occur.

Cognitive Theories of Interpersonal Relations

In the paragraphs above we have been discussing a cognitive theory that might best be described as an information processing theory. There we look at the teacher as a person who uses information as a basis for action. The significant research questions are primarily those related to how this information is organized and applied in the processes of acting, and how the consequences of the action affect subsequent processing of information. An information processing theory is concerned with such processes as attending and scanning, but generally the distortions of information which are associated with perceptual problems or difficulties are the focus of other kinds of theories.

The teacher is functioning in a situation which depends almost entirely on interaction with other individuals, namely the pupils. With the exception of the television teacher who may have no contact at all with students, the "live" teacher interacts constantly with pupils, even when the teacher is seemingly not interacting directly and immediately with the pupil, as for example, when the pupils are working at their desks and the teacher is correcting papers at his or her desk. Even in such cases the very nature of that kind of interaction is related to the quality of instruction (negatively). This interactive character of teaching is well known, and most individuals are sensitive to the ways in which this interaction is affected by internal processes of the teacher. But little formal theorizing has been done to explain how these internal processes systematically affect the quality and character of instruction, except in the case of the Pygmalion hypothesis.

Although there is also a widespread belief in the relation between the teacher's attitude and the treatment of the pupil, there is very little solid research evidence of such a connection, a statement that may seem strange because the belief in such a connection is so widespread and strongly held.

We are not disputing that there is a connection of this kind. We are pointing to the fact that the systematic study of such relations is yet to be done. The consequence also is that the use of formal social theory has had limited application in explaining how teachers interact with pupils and in predicting interactions or in developing systems for modifying teachers' behavior towards pupils. We are thinking here of such theories as attribution theory which appear at best very infrequently in the literature on teaching and in a very attenuated form, recognizable only to those who know a considerable amount about attribution theory. A survey of the handbooks of research on teaching reveals how little attention has been given to this aspect of the teaching act (even though the editor of the first edition of the Handbook of Research on Teaching was the initiator of a significant line of perceptual research in the early 1950's, this line of work was not pursued by enough investigators to put together a body of knowledge about perceptual processes in teaching).

We point to these facts because again we suspect that some of the problems of beginning teachers can be accounted for by understanding their attitudes and perceptions. The obvious example is the teacher from a middle-class background teaching pupils who are from a different socioeconomic background than the teacher or who belong to a different racial or ethnic group than the teacher. Such disparate memberships do not automatically mean that the teacher will have difficulties, but it is not unlikely that such discrepancies in attitudes or values lead to judgments on the part of the teacher which in turn lead to actions which create difficulties for the teacher. But how?

The beginning teacher has apparently little knowledge of the diversity of characteristics of the pupils he or she is teaching or is about to teach. The statement that they were unprepared for teaching is frequently backed up with anecdotes about how they found that students were unmotivated, or uninterested, or negative or hostile towards what the teacher was proposing to do. The beginning teacher also has difficulty accepting the reality of the level at which a student is capable of functioning; for example, a high school student who is reading at the fifth-grade level may be an anomaly to the teacher who has come out of a suburban, middle-class background where most of the students were reading at or above grade level.

Research on perception has been so rich over the past several decades, and seems so patently applicable, that it is surprising that the social psychology of the classroom is largely an understudied area.

It is our belief that attribution theory and its variations, and the study of the perceptual processes of teachers would reveal much about the beginning teachers that would be useful in explaining why they have certain kinds of problems.

Use of Various Cognitive Theories

In the preceding sections we have discussed two major kinds of cognitive theory which seem to be applicable to the study of the problems of beginning teachers, one of these being information processing type theories, and the other being attribution or perceptual-type theories of interactive behavior. We are not ready at the present time for an integration of these two theories since we do not even have sufficient empirical data to know how to use them in the study of the problems of teachers generally and of the problems of beginning teachers specifically. It seems likely at the present stage of our knowledge that both kinds of theories will be useful in accounting for different kinds of problems of beginning teachers. Information processing theories might be more useful for describing and explaining such processes as planning and evaluating; whereas attribution theory might be more useful in describing and explaining modes of interactive behavior between teachers and pupils.

There is another aspect of the use of cognitive theory that needs to be pointed out here, the relationship of cognitive theory to developmental theory. As is well known Piaget has promulgated a cognitive development theory which describes changes in children over time. We have earlier suggested that teachers appear to go through certain stages of development.

It may be that these stages of development are linked to stages of cognitive processing. The beginning teacher in the earliest stages of transition into teaching seems to function at a concrete operational level. Unfortunately for this theoretical analysis so much of the behavior is affected by anxiety that we cannot tell without further study whether the teacher would function at this level if they were not anxious, or whether it is the anxiety that is forcing a kind of regression to an earlier stage of cognitive functioning. Whatever the ultimate explanation may be it seems apparent that teachers in the beginning have functioned very much like children at the concrete operational stage.

It may also be that as teachers move to later stages of development, as they become more "professional", that is, more problem-solving in their orientation to tasks of teaching, that they are functioning at a higher cognitive level. It is not inconceivable that a teacher could organize his or her thinking about teaching and his approach to the acts of teaching in a rational way that corresponds to the formal stages of cognitive development. It would be very interesting if professional development had a base in cognitive development. (It is important to be aware that when we use the term "cognitive development" we are referring to a character of the cognitive processes in which the teacher engages, not to the amount of information they may have or even use.)

If such were the case we could develop an explanation which accounted for progress through the transition in terms of the teacher's ability to see problems in different ways. If such a description of cognitive process fit the empirical facts, we could then study the conditions under which the changes from one level of functioning to another occurred.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter we have been discussing the various ways we can think about why beginning teachers have the problems they have. The easiest explanation is a practical one--they were not trained for the task. Although this explanation has considerable validity, it is not a completely adequate explanation as far as we can determine. The beginning teacher is going through a transitional process which has other dimensions than task performance.

We have been pointing to the perspectives of beginning teachers, to their attitudes, to how they think about teaching tasks. We have been pointing to these aspects of functioning because such data as we have suggests that in time as the teacher passes through the transition period some changes occur in these attitudes and cognitions. There is also evidence that the failure to change leads to the continuation of a problem or to difficulties in learning how to solve the problem.

It seems very likely therefore that any explanation of why beginning teachers have problems will have to use several different theoretical approaches. If such is the case, then we need to be looking for both different facts and many more facts than we now have. It is relatively easy to document the lack of skill of beginning teachers in managing classes, but there is practically no documentation on how they cope with the anxiety they feel nor what their initial impressions of students are and how it affects their teaching, how they themselves have decided that certain ways of teaching are likely to be effective, how they think about effectiveness, what their goals for instruction are, how they evaluate their own performance, how they feel about themselves as teachers, their perceptions of their students' attitudes and beliefs, their knowledge about their students' attitudes and beliefs, their modes or styles of interacting with their pupils both as a group and as individuals. Why do beginning teachers have such a large number of "discipline" problems? Why are they so poorly organized? Why are they so depressed about their performance in these beginning stages?

The key to understanding the significance of questions about the beginning teacher is provided by the evidence that some teachers after many years of experience are indistinguishable from the beginning teacher. They have not mastered the most elementary tasks of organizing and conducting a class; they continue to have the problems they had in their first year of teaching. Obviously such situations indicate that having experience is not sufficient. It is necessary to acquire a skill or to change a point of view or attitude which lead to action which make the teacher at least minimally competent if not highly productive and effective.

The unfortunate pragmatic conclusion of what we have been saying is that we have very little understanding of why these problems occur so persistently and so regularly. In the course of these chapters we have pointed out the connection between understanding these problems and being able to provide teachers with the kind of context in which they can grow professionally. We know that teachers do not reach anywhere near a high level of professional development during their teacher preparation program. We might accept that there would always be considerable development based on experience, but a development beginning from a high level of initial professional competence. Such is not the case in teaching.

Initial skill is at best minimal and the transition into teaching is characterized by many problems related to competence and effectiveness.

We do need to establish the relationship between various kinds of training and this condition. We need to know whether changes in training, so that more performance training is emphasized, will lead to more competence and less trauma. The question of whether the internship is a necessary part of teacher preparation is related to this question.

If the internship provides the conditions under which the beginning teacher can achieve a greater level of competence because they are more carefully supervised during this period and because they have more opportunity to practice requisite skills, then we could presumably resolve some of the problems of beginning teachers by adopting such an effective way of preparing them. We will discuss the potentialities of the internship for this purpose in a later chapter.

But our strong suspicion is that many of these problems would persist because the beginning teacher is going through a fundamental developmental change. Some of this change would be experienced by anyone moving from a college program into the world of work. But the nature of teaching is such that it places tremendous demands on the practitioners.

Once the tasks of teaching are mastered they seem relatively simple, but the difficulties of learning them in the initial stages of teaching reveal their inherent complexity. Planning six months of work for thirty people is a major planning task. Organizing that instruction for six months is a major task. Most beginning jobs do not place these kinds of demands on the people entering them.

The teacher must continually adapt to a wide variety of individuals on a moment-by-moment basis. Other jobs require considerable interaction with individuals but many of these interactions are very brief and highly structured. The teachers' interactions must be continually adapted to the individuals involved, and to the role the teacher has with respect to them, a role that requires the teacher both to instruct and to evaluate the other person.

These comparisons of the beginning work of teachers with other jobs is a study that might be formally conducted. We think that the demands placed on some other kinds of professionals such as doctors and nurses are perhaps greater in some respects than those placed on the teacher, but this statement fits too easily the common stereotypes of these professions. We simply do not know what these initial demands are on beginning professionals or other workers; if we did, we might better understand the kind of preparation that is needed to meet these specific demands.

Running through all of the discussions and analysis in this chapter is a basic theme. We need to understand more about the processes in which the beginning teacher engages in order to move into teaching successfully. This study has many different aspects such as how the preparation program affects this transition, how the transition itself affects subsequent development, how the context of the transition affects the ease with which it is mastered, and many other complex problems of this kind.

The significance of understanding this transition and these problems is that we thereby will understand better what is required to become a teacher. Our assumptions about what is required to become a teacher are relatively simplistic. We give a basic program and some practice. We do know that teachers in preparation probably ought to have more practical experience, but we understand very little about how to help them succeed in the initial year of teaching with relative ease, without a loss of efficiency, and in such a way that they will be motivated to develop to the highest level of professional competence. Until we achieve this kind of understanding we have little basis for redesigning our program of preparation, or of creating programs which will help teachers master the transition period. Also our inservice programs will be poorly conceived because we have little understanding of what is required to move teachers from where they come out of the first year of teaching to a higher level of effectiveness.

It is all these considerations that have led us to talk about the theoretical, explanatory, predictive understanding of the problems of beginning teachers. We now need to look at the specifics of these problems and their course.

Chapter 4

THE KINDS OF PROBLEMS BEGINNING TEACHERS HAVE

The purpose of this chapter is to describe in some detail the specific kinds of problems which beginning teachers have. In the preceding chapters we have described the stages of change through which the teacher may pass and how solving problems in each of these stages influences the teachers' professional growth. We have also discussed theoretical conceptions which we might use to understand the nature of the beginning teachers' problems.

THE DYNAMICS OF THE PROBLEMS OF BEGINNING TEACHERS

Perhaps the aspect of the problems of beginning teachers which is least understood and has received practically no formal investigative analysis is the way in which the solution or the failure to solve certain problems creates a dynamic of success or failure. As one studies the surveys of the problems of beginning teachers, it is all too easy to think of these problems as if they were independent entities. The ordinary tools for data analysis such as factor analysis or cluster analysis are not used. As a consequence we have no notion of what the "factor structure" of these data is. We do not know whether we are dealing with a series of interconnected and interrelated problems that are in reality only a few problems, or whether we are dealing with many problems that bear little relation to each other, or whether we are dealing with a series of sequential problems that evolve out of each other. We do not know the priority or criticalness of these problems other than the inferences we make from our experience.

It may be that if a teacher solves a certain problem, other problems never occur. Or it may be that if a teacher has one particular kind of problem that is not solved, the failure to solve this problem may lead to other problems that in turn stimulate further problems.

In short we know very little about the structure of these problems, and even less about their dynamics. We can speculate about these dynamics on the basis of some information we have. We do know from observing experienced teachers that successful managers of classes usually are effective in managing from the first day of class. Those who are not effective from the beginning continue to have the same kinds of problems throughout the year. These unsolved problems then generate other kinds of problems.

Why These Problems Occur

So it is likely that some problems of beginning teachers are critical, and if not solved are likely to lead to others. It is also apparent that some problems are highly dependent on the sequence of events in the course of a year and on contextual factors. Some problems occur because the stimulus that creates the problem comes from an outside source, such as the school administrator who may choose to observe the beginning teacher frequently in the first six months of school, or who may choose to leave the beginning teachers alone until they are sure of themselves. The beginning teacher may be in a community where parents are highly critical of teachers and are likely to bear down on the beginning teacher if they suspect that the teacher is not totally competent.

We can say very little at this point except that the dynamics of this situation are perhaps the most important aspect to study. The methodology for doing so is obvious and at hand. We need to follow from before the beginning of the first day of teaching through most if not all of the first year a sample of beginning teachers in a variety of contexts. Following them means being in their classes, interviewing them, talking, if possible, to their students, studying and analyzing the kinds of materials and the instructional strategies they use, their evaluation procedures. We should observe how they talk to pupils, find out what their attitudes are towards people, discover how their teaching is affecting their feelings about themselves and their image of themselves. Only if we can follow beginning teachers in this way will we produce the data from which it might be possible to create a picture of the dynamics of the transitional period. Our understanding will depend, however, on the comprehensiveness and the variety of data, and we will probably need some kind of information of a comparable nature about experienced teachers.

We do not know, for example, if the crises and problems which the beginning teacher faces are not also faced by experienced teachers. There is reason to believe that at least some of them are faced on a regular basis by experienced teachers year after year. The problem is to find out what the differences are between the beginning teacher and the experienced teacher other than the longer period of time teaching.

Are the solutions of the experienced teacher the kind of solutions that are easily adapted or adopted by the beginning teacher? Has the experienced teacher more or less solved the problems once and for all? Do the experienced teachers feel the same trepidation and the same anxiety that the beginning teachers do, or have they acquired a sense of confidence and competence of such a character that they can cope with their anxiety as well as with the realities of teaching. That appears to be the case, though we have little empirical evidence for this conclusion other than our everyday observations of teachers.

It may be that we have taken too narrow a view of the problems of beginning teachers. It may be that the view of the teacher educator that the problems of teaching are generic has some validity. It may be, however, that the stage of development is the critical determinant of the experiences which the beginning teacher is having.

These alternatives need to be sorted out, studied in depth, and some resolution made of them. There is little excuse for our ignorance of the transitional period. Until we achieve greater understanding, it is unlikely that we will provide adequate means for helping beginning teachers master the transition period. As we shall see, even the strategies or procedures or methods that have been tried, such as the internship, suffer from a lack of understanding of what the problems of beginning teachers are. This point we will develop after we discuss in some detail the concrete realities of the problems of the beginning teacher.

The Effects of Solving Problems

If we think of the experiences that teachers have, we can detect these phases: 1) the teacher is first confronted with a situation for which he or she does not have adequate skills to cope with the situation; 2) the teacher then learns to solve the problems in this situation in some manner that effectively reduces the magnitude of the problem or eliminates it; 3) the teacher then moves on to a new level of performance which integrates into it the achievement of the problem-solving recently accomplished. This model of the problem-solving process represents what could happen and to some extent the best that could happen. Some teachers move through a sequence of problematic situations in this fashion. Others learn or adopt ineffective ways of solving problems that persist and interfere with the teacher's effectiveness. Other teachers will solve a problem but not move on to a higher stage of performance.

An example will make these facets of change more concrete for the reader. The managing of pupil behavior initially is a critical problem for beginning teachers. Most do not have the skills to manage pupils efficiently and effectively, and the challenge presents a threatening situation. They are frightened or anxious and unsure of themselves as they attempt to cope with this problem. The beginning teacher tries different ways of managing pupils mainly with a view to establishing order and on-task behavior in the class. If the methods used accomplish these two goals the teacher has effectively solved the problem as he or she has defined it.

But the methods used may not even be effective for the two limited but important goals of establishing order and on-task behavior. The teacher may perserverate in using the ineffective methods so that the management problem does not disappear or is not alleviated. Or, the teacher having solved the management problem may not use the acquired skill to achieve a higher level of teaching performance. If the teacher has not established sufficient control he or she will not try more complex teaching strategies.

We know from ordinary observations rather than empirical research that there are teachers who may not be able to manage a new class even though they have had considerable experience managing other classes. We also see the effects of not having mastered the transition period in teachers who may have been teaching for many years but still have no effective control over their classes.

What we know even less about is the dynamic that enables a teacher, having once solved the problem, to move on to a new level of performance. Obviously solving a critical problem does not guarantee that the teacher will take the next step or will be sufficiently secure to try more complex kinds of performances.

We can therefore draw two conclusions about how mastery of the transition period affects subsequent teaching. First, mastering the most basic problems in and of itself does not guarantee that a teacher will move to a higher level of professional performance; but second, not mastering these basic problems guarantees that the teacher will not move to a higher level of professional performance.

We are not certain how often the problems of the transition period recur in a teacher's subsequent experience. It may be that learning to solve these problems has to be repeated as the context of the teacher works changes. Obviously some adaptation or relearning or new learning is required as teachers move from one situation to a markedly or sufficiently different teaching situation.

It may be that all teachers' problems are "site-specific". This does not seem to be likely since such an idea would imply that each problem is independent of every other one. We are reasonably certain that this is not the case. But we are also equally certain that some teaching situations are markedly different on critical dimensions such as the aptitudes of pupils, the resources they have for educational development outside the school, the amount of supervision exercised over them when they are at home, the quality of their health care, their attitudes, and other factors which are well known to distinguish among different kinds of pupils and schools and communities.

In this chapter we are going to describe in some detail the sequence of problems through which a beginning teacher seems to go. We suspect that this sequence is invariant, that each beginning teacher will experience it irrespective of where he or she is teaching. What will vary is the intensity of some problems, the resources available for solving the problems and the probability that the problems can be solved by the efforts of the teacher.

We have put this sequence together from reading the literature, from theoretical analyses of problem-solving and learning and development, and from discussions with experienced teachers and supervisors who have worked with us. We are offering it as an outline for future research rather than as a complete description derived from empirical analysis.

This description differs from many descriptions in the literature in that it is concrete. Much of the study of the problems of beginning teachers is done by having them check lists of categories of problems. Although such lists are somewhat helpful, they offer only a very broad description of problems.

NOTABLE FEATURES OF THE PROBLEMS OF BEGINNING TEACHERS

Despite the difficulties presented by the available research and journalistic descriptions of beginning teachers' problems, there are some striking characteristics of this literature. The most important characteristic, because of its implications, is that the results are remarkably uniform and homogeneous despite differences in the research methodologies. Beginning teachers, wherever surveyed, say essentially the same kinds of things about their problems.

The second obvious characteristic is that these reported problems have two different kinds of origins. Some of these problems arise because of traits, habits, or lack of specific skills of the beginning teachers themselves. Other problems occur because of the context in which they function, and the beginning teacher has little control over their occurrence.

The third characteristic is that problems occur in a relatively predictable sequence. This predictability arises for two reasons: (1) events which produce the problem occur in sequence; and (2) solving or not solving a problem as it occurs contributes to the significance and difficulty of subsequent problems.

Some examples of these latter two aspects will give concrete meaning to these points. The beginning teachers' anxiety probably produces some unknown number of their initial problems. Also the beginning teachers' lack of skill produces some of the problems, as do certain attitudes or misperceptions of what students are like. A teacher who believes all students are eager to learn (as unrealistic as that may seem there are beginning teachers who have that perception) is likely to have difficulties in managing students and is likely to overreact when students do not respond as expected.

The teacher has the same problems that anyone has when expectations are not fulfilled in a situation. Frustrated expectations lead to predictable reactions on the part of the individual who is frustrated. Only a few reactions are mature and productive; most of the other reactions, such as anger or resentment or pressing harder to have the expectations realized are unproductive and generally increase the difficulties.

Examples of context problems that the beginning or experienced teacher cannot control are the visits of the principal of the school, calls from parents about their children and the occurrence of the grading period. Many principals do not schedule their visits to the beginning teacher, and even when they do the schedule is usually at the convenience of the principal. An upset, concerned, angry parent can call at any time, or even appear in the school demanding an interview with the teacher. The grading period is predictable but its occurrence, particularly for inexperienced teachers, may be inconvenient because they have not covered what they want to cover before the grading period, or they feel students have not reached a satisfactory level of performance and their tests will show it.

A teacher who has not planned well the sequence of instruction creates continuing and cumulative difficulties for himself or herself. Such a teacher does not finish material within a reasonable period of time, does not cover everything that he or she wants to or covers material differentially in terms of depth or scope. As a result, students reach new topics not adequatly prepared or are hurried through one topic to make up for too much time spent on an earlier topic. The beginning teacher has to learn how to pace the presentation of material and the sequence of instructional tasks so that difficulties of these kinds do not occur.

Another example of accumulating difficulties are those that arise out of poor management of instruction. Once the pupils realize that they do not have to meet certain requirements, their behavior will conform less to the standards. As they begin to test the limits, the task of managing the class becomes increasingly difficult.

Training for the transition period or the kind of support and assistance provided during it will depend on the nature of the problem. Whatever the sequence in which a problem occurs, the solution to it must be adapted to the nature of that particular problem. If, for example, the teacher is coping with a problem over which he or she has little control, the solution to the problem requires a form of adaptation; whereas if the teacher can control the problem, there are many aspects of the situation that the teacher may be able to change. In some cases the nature of the problem may require changes in perspective rather than in the acquisition of skill; whereas other problems can be solved simply by acquiring appropriate skills. We are therefore beginning here to untangle the undifferentiated array of problems which are typically revealed in surveys of beginning teachers' problems.

A SYSTEM FOR CLASSIFYING TEACHERS' PROBLEMS

Figure 1 presents a simple classification of these problems along two major dimensions. One of these dimensions is the source of the problem and the other is the locus of control of the problem. By the source of the problem we mean whether the problem arises within the teacher or whether it arises from an agent outside the teacher. We have used two terms, "endogenous" to refer to problems which arise because of attitudes, orientations, perspectives, or the behavior of the teacher; and "exogenous" for problems which arise because somebody else creates the situation that makes the problem for the teacher.

The locus of control of the problem refers to who has the resources, the skills or the means to solve the problem. The two major sources are the teacher or other people, and we have allowed for the possiblity of an unrecognized source in this latter category. Table 1 lists some examples of teachers' problems within the four classifications.

Figure 1

Matrix of Teachers' Problems Based on Source of the Problem and the Amount of Control Which a Teacher Has Over the Problem*

LOCUS OF CONTROL

	By Teacher	By Other Agent or Unrecognized Source
Endogenous	(1) 1. Preparation of a lesson's content 2. Preparation of instructional material 3. Preparation of an instructional plan . . .	(2) 1. Unconscious anxiety or fear 2. Subconscious effect of attitudes and values . . .
Exogenous	(3) 1. Organization of required curriculum for class 2. Requests for materials of instruction 3. Requests for assistance or direction . . .	(4) 1. Visits by supervisory staff 2. Visits by angry parents 3. Outbursts by emotionally disturbed children . . .

*See the accompanying list in Table 1.

TABLE 1: List of Some Teachers' Problems by Source and Amount of Control Which a Teacher Has Over the Problem

CLASSIFICATION OF TEACHERS' PROBLEMS

(Cell 1) **Endogenous and Under Teacher's Direct Control**

1. Preparation of a lesson's content
2. Preparation of instructional material
3. Preparation of an instructional plan
4. Establishing routines
5. Establishing rules
6. Managing instruction
7. Conducting instruction
8. Evaluating instruction

.
.
.

(Cell 2) **Endogenous and Not Under Teacher's Direct Control**

1. Unconscious anxiety or fear
2. Subconscious effects of attitudes and values
3. Reactions to life-threatening situations or attacks

.
.
.

(Cell 3) **Exogenous and Under Teacher's Direct Control**

1. Organization of required curriculum for class being taught
2. Requests for materials of instruction
3. Requests for assistance or direction
4. Scheduling meetings with parents
5. Fitting instruction to a variable school schedule

.
.
.

(Cell 4) **Exogenous and Not Under Teacher's Direct Control**

1. Visits by supervisory staff
2. Visits by angry parents
3. Outbursts by emotionally disturbed children
4. Physical attacks by students
5. Fire drills
6. Announcements over PA systems
7. General curriculum of school
8. Pupils assigned to classes
9. Classes, subjects or grades to be taught

.
.
.

Endogenous Problems Under the Teacher's Direct Control

Endogenous problems under the direct control of the teacher are problems that arise because of the teacher's characteristics or behavior. Most of the instructional demands placed on the teacher fall into this category. The teacher, for example, has to plan instruction. If the teacher fails to plan instruction, the lessons become disorganized and other difficulties usually arise as a consequence. The teacher can prepare the content, the instructional materials and the instructional plan. No one does this for the teacher. If the teacher chooses not to do it or does not do it well, he or she suffers the consequences.

Individuals may lack skill or experience in planning. Since this is a problem that is directly under the control of the teacher, it can be solved if the teacher acquires the necessary skills, which means the teacher must have some means of acquiring this skill or be self-taught. Beginning teachers who face these problems realize that they could have been taught skills like this to least at some level of proficiency so that they would not be so badly organized when they began teaching. It may be, however, that only a limited aspect of planning can be taught, and that continuous practice is needed to acquire sufficient proficiency in planning.

All of the problems in this category we expect to be problems that the teacher can either solve by problem-solving, or can be prepared for by adequate training. These are problems that ought not to exist; if they do, they ought to be remediable.

Endogenous Problems Not Under the Teacher's Direct Control

These are problems that occur within the teacher but are not recognized by the teacher. The solution of these problems requires elaborate methods beyond the scope of ordinary training. The teachers' reactions to attacks by students are a case in point. In the first place the attacks ought not to be occurring, and their occurrence is presumably not provoked by the teacher; even if the teacher were provocative, the response is inappropriate and intolerable. But the teacher is unprepared for such attacks, usually, and will therefore react instinctively. Whatever these instinctive reactions are will lead to behavior that may not be effective and productive for resolving that particular problem. The teacher may have no resources whatsoever for coping with the subsequent consequences. These events are unusual, and like most unusual, traumatic events the individuals participating in them fall back on whatever resources they can bring to bear on the solution of the problem.

Another example is the kinds of unconscious reactions that color all human behavior. The teacher dislikes a pupil but is not really sure why. The teacher has "explanations" but may have some feeling that these explanations lack validity, and observers will recognize that the explanations may be irrelevant or invalid. Physical characteristics of the teacher may evoke responses in the student. The teacher has limited control over most physical characteristics, and no control over some. The responses evoked therefore have to be dealt with in a way different than one would deal with problems where the teacher could do something about the characteristic. A teacher can do something about planning, but not about his height or what his face looks like.

Exogenous Problems Under the Teacher's Control

Exogenous problems under the teacher's control are problems that are started by somebody else's behavior or actions but which the teacher can influence, remove or resolve. The most obvious examples are the actions of students which arise from their own feelings or attitudes or that are in response to a particular stimulus. Pupils who shout out in class, fall asleep, forget materials, etc., do these things for reasons that frequently have nothing to do with what the teacher has done. But the teacher must react in some way to these actions and can usually devise means to obviate them in the future. We do not pretend that such solutions are easy, nor that the solutions will follow quickly, but the problems in this category are within the realm of being remediable.

We would expect therefore to be able to train teachers to meet these problems effectively. The complaints of the beginning teachers so frequently center around the kinds of examples that we have given that it is obvious they believe that they could have been prepared to cope with such problems. One of the most frequent questions asked by all teachers is, "What do you do if a student...?" Teachers rely heavily on each other's experience for solving these problems which suggest that if these experiences could be accumulated, they could be passed on in a systematic way during training so that each generation of teachers did not have to learn the solutions for themselves all over again.

Exogenous Problems Not Under the Teacher's Direct Control

Exogenous problems not under the teacher's control are problems initiated by the actions of another person whose consequences the teacher cannot affect directly or whose course may not necessarily be stayed by actions of the teacher. One of the most annoying examples in this category are announcements on a P.A. system. There are principals who are frequently "on the horn", with comments that border on the trivial or unnecessary. These interruptions occur in the course of a class, and the class may stop momentarily. A teacher can do very little about this behavior, except possibly complain, but the habit seems to be related to personality characteristics and is not easily modified by complaints. The teacher has to adapt and has to teach the students to adapt to a situation over which he or she has relatively little or no control.

The reactions of parents to the evaluations and grades of their children is variable, and in some cases takes rather extreme forms. Irate parents show up in school demanding to sit in classrooms to observe teachers; they go to school board members and complain about a teacher; they complain to the principal; they complain publicly at meetings of the Parent Teachers Association. They may confront the teacher in the classroom and insult him or her in front of the pupils. Whatever the origins of these reactions, they are usually out of proportion, to the behavior of the teacher, and have their origins in the inner dynamics of the parents.

The teacher can cope with such problems by adapting to them, but the teacher cannot prevent them. The teacher needs help to learn methods for coping with problems over which he or she has no control. Training is on "how to handle angry parents", a category that appears frequently in surveys of the problems of beginning teachers.

Obviously problems of this kind are more complex because of their origins, and the solution may lie well beyond what could be normally expected when human beings interact. Some of these problems may not be resolvable even by learning to adapt to them. It is very difficult for a teacher to cope with an autistic child who has been mainstreamed into her class. It is dubious whether this is the most efficient and effective form of education for this child, except in very limited respects. Even if we train the teacher to work with an autistic child, the circumstances in which he or she has to work with this child make the real solution of the problem extraordinarily difficult. It is necessary to raise and to judge critically whether solutions to certain kinds of problems can always be expected of teachers, even if we help them to understand the nature of these problems and give them skills in coping with them.

UNDERSTANDING THE PROBLEMS OF BEGINNING TEACHERS

The problems of beginning teachers seem to occur in predictable stages. This sequence has never been carefully traced out, and we are relying in describing it on detailed and lengthy talks with a small number of experienced teachers. The future research ought to trace the sequence of these problems by a careful study of a group of beginning teachers. These teachers should be interviewed frequently and regularly during the first six months of their first full-time teaching exerience. They also should be interviewed periodically after that through probably the first three years of their teaching. The early interviews ought to pick up the initial, critical problems. The continuing interviews during the first six months should gather data on how the teachers react to their problems, how they solve them, and what kinds of patterns of teaching behavior and coping behavior they acquire. The interviews in the latter six months of the first year should be focused on how the earlier experiences affected the development of the teacher in the course of the first year. Interviews in following years ought to be reflective in character, looking back on how the early experience influenced attitudes, beliefs, practices; how experience modified the early perceptions; how problem-solving skills were acquired and used.

Previous research has not used a methodology relevent to answering the question, is there a common sequence of problems which the beginning teacher faces. We are therefore handicapped in not having precise empirical data on the existence of such a sequence, its character and course. We offer an outline in the following sections of a sequence of problems faced by beginning teachers which ought to be treated as a hypothesis.

It may be that some of the problems which we will describe are tightly bound to particular contexts, and therefore are not likely to occur for every beginning teacher. We have, however, attempted to winnow out context bound problems from the general problems likely to be faced by all beginning teachers. Some of these problems may be the result of the personality characteristics of the individuals to whom we spoke; but again, we attempted to distinguish between descriptions of problems which seemed to be heavily influenced by individual or idiosyncratic perceptions of one's teaching experience and those which were shared by the individuals to whom we spoke.

Also we have little information on the range or variability of these problems. Our sampling was opportunistic in the sense that we talked with teachers whom we knew and who would spend some time talking with us about their problems. We had the advantage of the experience of staff members who in several different roles had supervised beginning teachers and who had worked with them over a number of years. One of our number also had considerable experience as a Teacher Specialist whose role was to provide service and assistance to teachers in twenty-five schools in a large county district. By using the experience of these staff members we could generalize what we were hearing from our informants.

We will have said at many points in this report that the problems of beginning teachers are largely an unstudied problem, a fact which becomes painfully apparent when one attempts to describe in detail what these problems are, how frequently they occur, who is likely to have them, how they are influenced by the context in which the teacher is teaching, whether they occur in some order, how amenable they are to training in teaching skills, how dependent they are on the teachers' attitudes and beliefs, and a variety of such questions which are of the essence if one wishes to describe in an orderly and precise fashion the nature of the problems of beginning teachers and what may or may not be done to help teachers solve these problems.

With these emendations on what will be our text in the rest of this chapter, we are ready to proceed with a description of the sequence of problems experienced by most beginning teachers in most places.

Components of Problems

Each of the problems which we will describe will be described in terms of five major components. These are:

1. Time of the problem
2. Initiating stimulus
    a. Character of the presenting cause
    b. Source of the presenting cause
3. Locus of control

4. The focus of the problem
    - a. Management
    - b. Instruction
    - c. Curriculum

5. Major consequences
    - a. On instruction
    - b. On effectiveness
    - c. On growth in teaching competence
    - d. On sense of self-worth and self-esteem

In the following paragraphs we define each of these concepts.

Time: When the problem occurs typically or usually. The designation of time will usually be in terms of a portion of the year or time of the year, such as the first week of school, the first day, the first six months. Time designations are relatively imprecise because of the lack of information on when these problems occur, and in part because some of them do vary as a function of the teacher's situation. The occurrence of other problems are dependent to some extent on the solution of preceding problems, and therefore the timing of the second problem depends upon if and when the first problem was solved. The ability to solve certain problems determines when later problems occur; therefore, problems are of varying duration across different teachers.

All of these types of solutions influence precision in marking the beginning and the end of certain kinds of major problems. In the case of some teachers the end never actually occurs; the problem persists.

Initiating stimulus: Something causes the problem to occur. These "causes" are quite varied in character. Some of them come from outside the classroom by virtue of actions of parents or administrators, or the central office or the custodial service. In others the "cause" is in the classroom in particular people, for example, the actions of individual pupils cause certain kinds of problems to occur. The teacher himself or herself is a potential cause of problems because of the way he or she acts or does not act. Every problem has some originating source of this character which creates the problem situation.

These initiating stimuli have two characteristics, one, the source itself, and two, its character. In the above paragraph we have been describing the initiating stimuli in terms of different sources. The character of the problem may be administrative, interpersonal, management, or quality control.

An administrative problem is one related to the functioning of the system at whatever level. The teacher, for example, is responsible for checking on the attendance of pupils; the failure to do so or to do the job poorly creates problems. Or the administration may have an attendance-taking system which is so complicated that it becomes unduly difficult or time-consuming for the teacher, and increases the likelihood that the teacher may make errors or be tempted to be careless. Other administrative problems occur when fire drills are called, when announcements have to be made to pupils, when administrative actions such as collecting money or dispensing tickets, arranging for the year-book pictures, or arranging for field trips or class picnics occur. Administrative problems are indirectly related to instruction and frequently interfere with formal instruction even though they may be useful or necessary in the life of the school. They almost invariably add work for the teacher and generally complicate classroom management problems. They are pervasive and unavoidable. Skill in handling them is essential; and attitudes towards them affect the teacher's comfort and sense of security.

Interpersonal problems are those that arise out of interactions with individuals whether they be administrators, parents, fellow teachers, or pupils. These are problems occasioned by the way they treat the teacher. These other individuals may have expectations which the teacher feels are unrealistic; they may make demands; they may offer or refuse help of one kind or another. These are in essence problems which are occasioned by the way people interact with each other and treat each other.

They too are unavoidable, but solving them depends in large part on the teacher's personality characteristics and skill in solving personal problems. When these problems are solved adequately and competently, the teacher usually provides himself or herself with support; one's sense of self-worth is enhanced. Failure to solve them usually results in social isolation, depression, anxiety and frequently more serious emotional problems.

Design problems are problems related to the development of the instructional and curricular system that the teacher will direct and conduct. Such problems include the problems of planning and organization, the development of the appropriate content for and materials of instruction, the creation of evaluative systems, the organization of a grading system, and all other matters related to the essential tasks of teaching. These are complex problems requiring skill, and many of them are a persistent source of difficulty for teachers irrespective of the amount of formal experience they may have accumulated. The solution of these problems is directly related to the development of the teacher's competence. The teacher's professional development depends on his or her capabilities of coping with the basic problems in this category.

Management problems, which we have described frequently in this report, are the problems created by conducting instruction and all aspects of it. They occur on a daily basis. They vary from setting rules and giving directions to insuring on-task behavior and work orientation to the preservation of good social order and amiability in the classroom to preserving respect for individuals, both pupils and teachers, to coping with the crises created by children who are emotionally distraught or disturbed. They are variable in character, partly dependent on the character of the school in which the teacher is teaching and heavily influenced by how the teacher copes with them. They are a perennial and persistant source of anxiety for teachers, and failure to solve them usually has disastrous consequences. A teacher's sense of self-worth and self-esteem is strongly affected by the ability to solve these problems.

Quality control problems are problems related to maintaining a high order of effectiveness both in the act of instructing and in the work done by pupils. Quality control problems involve problems of setting and maintaining standards, monitoring one's own performance and that of pupils, establishing clear evaluative criteria, and administering evaluation processes with justice and prudence. The level of the problem ranges from moment-by-moment interactions with pupils to the orderly arrangement of instructional and evaluative tasks.

These general descriptions of problems indicate both the variety and the multiplicity of the problems facing the beginning teacher. At a later point we will discuss the criticality of these problems because they do differ in the seriousness of failure to solve them.

Locus of control: We introduced this significant dimension of problems in describing the matrix in Figure 1. By the locus of control we mean who has the power to solve the problem or to alleviate it. This person is frequently the person who is also the source of the problem though not exclusively so. An administrator may create a problem by calling a fire drill, an act for which he or she can hardly be faulted. The administrator has control over the occasion, but probably has no choice about calling a fire drill at some time. The teacher has no control over when the fire drill will be called. But the teacher does have control over the instruction of his or her pupils about how to act during the fire drill and the supervision of them at the time at which it is called. The teacher has control over how the problem will be handled as it occurs, even though the problem itself is the result of actions taken by other individuals.

A teacher has control over his or her own behavior and many of its consequences. A teacher does not have control over the interior emotional life of the pupil which may cause the pupil to say and do things with which the teacher has to cope. A teacher has control over the organization of instruction, over the methods of instruction, and over the methods of evaluation.

As can be seen in this brief listing of varying degrees of control by the teacher over problems, there are some problems over which the teacher has most or exclusive control. There are other problems over which the teacher has practically no control as to when they occur, how they occur, and some of their consequences. A third category of problems is controlled by the teacher and by other people equally or partially or in sequence.

When we say the teacher has control over a problem, we mean that the actions of the teacher are highly likely to affect the course of the problem and its outcome. In some cases, however, the teacher is dependent on other individuals for resources, which if available, enable the teacher to take actions which would solve the problem. There is, we suspect, more confusion around this idea than almost any other aspect of the question of who is responsible for effective problem-solving in these various domains. A teacher may have a solution which requires resources which can be provided only by another person such as an administrator; but it may be that the problem could be solved in another way without requiring these resources. It is then moot as to who has final control until we resolve which is the most effective form of solving of the problem.

Clearly if the teacher's actions can resolve the problem, and those actions can be taken in some form, the teacher is responsible for solving the problem. The teacher may be responsible for solving a problem only in the most effective way if resources are provided by other individuals. Before a teacher can be held accountable for solving a problem, it must be clearly demonstrated that the problem can be resolved by actions of the teacher.

Consequences of problem solving: The solving of a problem or the failure to solve a problem has immediate and specific consequences and others that are long term. The dimension of consequence is important in making judgments about the critical character of the problem. Usually any problem that has long-term consequences is the more serious problem. However, the failure to solve some problems can have immediate and most serious consequences. These are frequently problems related to health, safety and welfare of children or the teacher. Mistakes in instruction are remediable, and most instruction is so redundant that errors can be counterbalanced by subsequent instruction.

This dimension is of interest, but not of great significance, for understanding the nature of the problem. If we know that a problem has long-term consequences, this information may do no more than point to the importance of the problem or to some future effects that the teacher will have to anticipate. An important point, but perhaps not the most serious or significant consequence of the problems which teachers face.

A more important kind of consequence is the character of the consequence; for example, what is the nature of the effect, what aspects of the instructional system does it affect. Among the most serious kinds of consequences are those which affect instruction directly. These may have effects on the quality of instruction, on its organization and on aspects of organization such as pacing.

There are interactions between the character of problems and their consequences; for example, problems of design have consequences on the quality and organization of instruction, and problems in management may have consequences on the pacing of instruction.

Obviously all of these effects are multiple; they may interact; they may occur in sequence and then recur. As we probe deeper into these complexities the lack of data makes analysis more and more speculative. Therefore we will limit ourselves to pointing out certain major consequences, some obvious interactions, and some directions in which we might look for other kinds of consequences.

Effects on instruction are a good example of its complexity. The failure to design instruction well usually has an immediate consequence, and is likely to have a long-term consequence. It affects management of instruction, which in turn may create problems in management, which in turn may affect problems in design.

The consequences on instruction are variable in their seriousness. Some consequences are relatively minor, such as temporary disorganizations or an arrangement of curriculum which is too complicated for students to grasp, or a poor choice of instructional strategy. Usually errors are redeemable, though the ability to redeem them and to gain momentum and focus or direction probably depends on the teacher having considerable problem-solving skill and instructional effectiveness.

The failure to solve some problems affect the teacher's effectiveness. Some problems have a direct and immediate or relatively quick effect on effectiveness. The failure to instruct individual pupils well at certain times may considerably reduce the teacher's effectiveness with those pupils. Persistent failure to interact and work with certain pupils may mean that those pupils do not learn as well and the teacher's effectiveness is thereby reduced.

Research has shown that teachers do vary considerably in effectiveness when effectiveness is defined as the amount of growth of pupils in learning over the course of a year. Some teachers do insure that all pupils make some gains; whereas other teachers produce gains only for students who are initially in the upper half of the class.

Obviously a teacher's effectiveness depends only in part on what the teacher does. Whether the pupils respond appropriately may also depend upon what the teacher does, so that effectiveness is a consequence primarily of the teacher's own behavior. The degree of effectiveness which the teacher achieves seems to depend in large part on the kinds of skills the teacher has and the kinds of attitudes and ideas that guide his or her behavior. These statements do not imply that every teacher must be omnicompetent or that effectiveness measured in terms of how much pupils learn depends exclusively on the teacher. These statements simply assert that the teacher's effectiveness is a product of what the teacher does. Therefore the kinds of problems that a beginning teacher is able to solve affect how well the beginning teacher teaches.

We do not know as yet which problems are the ones that substantially affect a teacher's effectiveness; that is, we do not know these things with empirical precision. The research referred to above, our experience, and teacher's own views strongly suggest that matters related to the organization and management of instruction directly and substantially affect the teacher's effectiveness. But there is some evidence to suggest that the quality of the substance which the teacher presents also affects effectiveness, and though previous research has not indicated sharp distinctions in methodology, obviously there are likely to be at least a few methodologies or teaching strategies which are more effective for certain kinds of outcomes, than others.

The difficulties created by failure to solve problems and their effects on the teacher's effectiveness are very apparent in the case of beginning teachers. Though again we lack precise data on the effects of the weaknesses or inadequacies of beginning teachers, it is strongly believed that they do have substantial effects on pupil learning.

We need research which uses as independent variables the teaching practices of teachers who have or do not have certain kinds of problems or who are skillful or not skillful in solving certain kinds of problems. We can then measure the effects of these achievements or lack of achievements on pupil learning. A beginning teacher, for example, who has difficulties in managing a class may not be less effective in the long run if the teacher eventually is able to solve these management problems. But if the problems persist, then we ought to look for effects on pupils in the amount they learn, their motivation and interest, and their attitudes towards what is being taught. We would not expect a disorganized class to create a very positive attitude towards the subject being taught; nor would we expect students in such a class to learn as much as students who are in a class where instruction runs smoothly.

Another consequence of failure to solve the problems of beginning teachers is the effect on growth in teaching competence. We have discussed this aspect of the experience of the beginning teacher in another chapter. Again we must point out we have relatively little data on which to rely, but considerable accumulated experience and observation of daily teaching. We need not repeat here what we have said in considerable detail in other sections. The essence of those comments is that the failure to solve certain problems practically guarantees that the teacher will not grow in teaching competence. The failure to achieve adequate solutions to certain kinds of problems will probably result in the teacher's learning to use certain kinds of survival "tricks" which the teacher will continue to use indefinitely into the future.

Perhaps the most serious consequence for beginning teachers who fail to solve their problems is the failure to grow in teaching competence and to develop professionally.

Another serious consequence of teachers failing to solve their problems is the effect on their sense of self-worth or self-esteem. There is ample evidence in the experience of individuals working with beginning teachers to indicate that failure to solve problems has a devastating effect on a sense of self-esteem and self-worth. The consequences at times are so serious that individuals leave the teaching profession. In contrast, the teacher who solves these problems develops a sense of esteem of himself or herself as an effective teacher, realizes that he or she has the requisite capabilities for doing the job of teaching, and grows in satisfaction and security in teaching.

These dimensions portray how complex the problems of the beginning teachers may be and how various aspects of them affect the beginning teacher. Ultimately we ought to be able to scale the problems of beginning teachers along these various dimensions. We can think of these problems as being located in a multidimensional space with these dimensions as the major components. Each generic kind of problem ought to be scalable along one of these dimensions.

If this type of analysis were performed, we could then study the seriousness of the various problems in terms of their relation to each other along these dimensions and the potentialities for interaction among the problems. Such analyses would lead to a deeper understanding of the problem and would also stimulate thinking about how these problems might be anticipated, alleviated, and solved.

But before such scaling can be done, it is necessary to have exact information on how the problems of beginning teachers occur, when they occur, what forms they take, and the variety of variables that affect them. What we will describe in the following section is a preliminary projection of what that data might look like if it were collected systematically, as it should be.

THE SPECIFIC PROBLEMS OF THE BEGINNING TEACHER

Numerous surveys, which we have summarized in our review of the literature in Volume Three of this series of reports have described the specific problems of beginning teachers. Each of these reports has been compiled by gathering data in one or more different ways. One way in which data were collected was to have the investigator present beginning or experienced teachers with a checklist of problems, asking them to indicate those which they had had in the early days of their teaching. Another method was to ask people to describe their problems through interviews or by writing, and from these descriptions to sort out and categorize the common problems.

As we have said above, we have utilized every source of information available to us to put together the descriptions which follow. These descriptions are amalgams from these different sources and reflect in varying degrees the availability or paucity of formal research data. There are aspects of the beginning teacher's life which are known to many people but are not covered in the literature, and in such cases we have not hesitated to suggest what these problems might be. We are here concerned less with the source of the data than with its validity. If we have reason to believe that an idea or some information is reliable and valid, we have used it. But as we have said earlier, the concepts and ideas presented here are offered as a projective hypothesis or theory of change or theory of initiation into an organization which needs to be tested, substantiated in detail, filled out and revised on the basis of more thorough and comprehensive surveys than are now available in the research literature.

The Context of the Beginning Teacher's Problems

The majority of beginning teachers are recent college graduates though there are a small number of individuals who enter teaching in midlife. We do not know if the problems of these two groups are markedly different; we suspect that they are not, a suspicion based in part on the observation of a small number of middle-aged adults who entered teaching in an internship program in which one of the members of this staff worked. What is more significant for interpreting the literature and understanding the experience of most people who have observed beginning teachers is that the majority of these beginners are young college graduates. This fact needs to be taken into account in thinking about some of the problems that beginning teachers have.

The life experience of the young beginning teacher in most cases has been relatively sheltered and in part planned by others. Although the graduate has chosen to go to college, has picked a major, has chosen to enter teaching for whatever reason, the path to the goals of these choices has been structured by others. The curricula for preparation to become a teacher has been prescribed, and many aspects of the experience of the beginning teacher as he or she gets ready to teach have been selected and made available to them by other individuals; for example, much of the practicum experience of the beginning teachers is selected for them by their instructors. In a very real sense therefore the beginning teacher is now moving from a life highly planned and controlled by other individuals into a life where this teacher will have to make numerous choices and decisions which he or she has not made before.

Because the beginning teacher is moving from college into the world of work he or she is faced with many other decisions. The beginning teacher, for example, may have moved to a new community to take the teaching position. The beginner has to set up a place to live with all the attendant problems on this decision. Beginning teachers may have to think about furnishing an apartment, whether they are going to live with other individuals, how to budget their money, how to equip themselves for daily living, how they will travel to and from work, what kinds of recreation will be available to them, and what kinds of social environments they will live in.

At the same time some beginning teachers will have recently made a significant life choice, the choice of a marriage partner. Many beginning teachers may well be embarking on their married life with the adjustments and adaptations attendant upon being married becoming a focal point in their daily life. Others will be engaged; they may be living away from their fiances with the stresses and loneliness that such distances make; or they may be traveling to see their fiance on every weekend in which they are free to do so. Others will be concerned about companionship and dating.

We all know how important such aspects of life are. They certainly influence how the beginning teacher adapts to the first days of teaching. It is not easy to be settling in a new place to live with all the practical problems that this settling requires, and at the same time be planning lessons and working with pupils and learning how to master the first stages of teaching in the school year.

Relatively little is said in the literature about how such changes influence how the beginning teacher relates to the problems of teaching. As in many descriptions of professionals entering jobs, the descriptions discuss only the professional's worklife, and unless one is either reminded or thinks of it, it is easy to forget that the persons being described live a larger life.

The absence of information on such factors makes it difficult for us to understand with any depth the kinds of problems beginning teachers have had. In an earlier chapter we have said that what we may be observing when we see beginning teachers confront and solve certain kinds of problems are phases in the development of that teacher as a person. It is important that we understand the context in which these problems are being solved and how that context affects the solution of the problems; here we are referring primarily to the out-of-school life of the teacher; at a later point we will discuss how the school context affects the solution of these problems.

Consider a young beginning teacher who moves to a new community several hundred miles from his or her home. The community is entirely new; and may be quite different from the one in which he or she lived, but even if it is similar, he or she knows so little about it that for all practical purposes it is a totally strange environment. Later the similarities to previous places of living will resolve some problems, but not initially. The beginning teacher may not know anyone in this community. This may be the first time he or she is living alone--there is no dormitory group, fraternity brothers or sorority sisters; at best the beginning teacher may be sharing an apartment with one or two other teachers.

We need not expand on how isolated and lonely a life this can be and how likely it is that the teacher will be struggling with the problems of social isolation and learning to live alone. Some teachers may be overwhelmed by this aspect of their first job; others may know how to cope easily and with efficiency. These differences in these life circumstances which happen to be associated with most beginning teaching affect how the teacher will think and feel about the school or the pupils.

The strangeness of the community may produce an attitude which carries over into the classroom where the teacher sees the pupils as strange or different or unlike children that he or she has known. The teacher's mood is obviously affected by whether he or she is comfortable outside of the classroom.

We are making much of this aspect of the beginning teacher's life, partly because it is neglected in research. Therefore we need this missing information in order to understand how beginning teachers cope with the problems of teaching because the key to the adaptation to teaching may lie in part in how socially mature and self-reliant the individual is. If the individual is really lonely for the first time and is learning genuine independence, some of the problems of teaching may be complicated by the need for this learning; whereas others who have mastered the major aspects of living independently, and who have therefore less emotional problems and more practical problems (such as where is the nearest laundry or grocery?) are more likely to carry the responsibilities of initial teaching with competence.

Another way of looking at this time in a teacher's life is to say that many problems of teaching can be dealt with on the basis of skills that one uses in places and situations other than teaching. Maturity of point of view, independence, self-reliance, confidence in seeking information and help are broadly useful characteristics in life and certainly must have some effect on how well teachers make the transition into teaching.

The Solubility of the Beginning Teacher's Problems

We have discussed at various points aspects of how the beginning teacher will solve problems. Obviously we are reserving to a later point a discussion of solutions to these problems. But it would be useful for the reader to keep a concept in mind as we go through descriptions of specific problems. This concept is a distinction among problems that are soluble immediately, problems that are soluble only in time and others that are not soluble at all.

In the following sections we will be discussing problem after problem. These will appear to be complicated, usually will have many interrelated aspects, and the critical aspect of the problem will be difficult to isolate. Some problems or their parts will obviously be soluble; whereas others will remain essentially insoluble, and will continue to be a source of annoyance and distress to the teacher.

Many of the instructional problems are soluble. Planning is possible; people know how to do it; there are criteria for judging whether the planning has been effective; the results of good or poor planning are easily observed. So if beginning teachers are poor planners because they have had little experience at planning or have little idea of how to go about it, it is possible for them to acquire the skills involved in planning.

Other problems arise because of the interaction between the teacher and pupils. Some particular problems in this category may not resolve themselves easily because the problem does not arise because of what the teacher is doing or is like. The pupil's emotional state is frequently affected by or determined by events outside the classroom over which the teacher has no influence. The mood of a pupil may be dependent upon the way his father spoke to him at breakfast or whether an attractive girl in whom he is interested responded to his salutation. These moods, attitudes, feelings and beliefs influence how this pupil acts in class and may create a genuine problem for the teacher. While the teacher may be able to modify some of the effects of these moods and feelings and beliefs, he or she may not be able to solve the underlying problem.

Other problems are recurring, such as management problems which are continual problems. On the basis of available research, limited though it is, it seems that if the teacher establishes a structure for management at the beginning of the year the most obvious and difficult problems are obviated, particularly if the teacher continues to use that structure as a guide for action in the classroom. But planning and the design of instructional strategies and evaluation are problems which occur daily in various forms and are the essence of teaching. They are solved when the teacher knows how to cope with them and has to think of new solutions only when unusual events occur.

There probably is a limit on how much the beginning teacher can be taught about these problems. Presumably the preparation program can teach basic skills of teaching, can assist in planning and teach some planning skills, can teach evaluation skills, can monitor preliminary experiences, and can talk to the beginning teacher about his or her attitudes and perceptions. But obviously there is a level of adaptation to teaching which comes only with experience. The ease and comfort of being able to move from week to week and to surmount the daily crises is a high order of problem-solving. Such orientation, behaviors, and other complex components of these actions can be taught but not in the didactic sense of the word. Rather, teachers need someone to talk with, to watch what they do in order to advise them, to be a sounding board for ideas, to make suggestions, and to model for them.

In these sentences we lay the base for a distinction between the first level of learning to be a teacher and the more complex levels which are usually implied in the term "professional development". But in thinking out the problems of beginning teachers this distinction is also useful because some of the problems of the beginning teacher are probably due to the lack of didactic instruction on the basics of organizing and conducting instruction. Other problems are related to what the beginners are like as people, how mature they are, and how self-reliant they are. Still other problems can be solved only as teachers become more experienced at which time they may need the assistance of a mature, experienced competent model, colleague, collaborator and counsellor.

We think it useful to think about these problems in terms of two dimensions: one, the solubility dimension -- when the problem can be resolved, what resources are needed; how much control does the beginning teacher have over the problem; and two, what for lack of a better term we will call the level of the problem -- some problems are problems of skill, and if one can acquire the appropriate skill the problem will be solved; whereas, other problems are problems of learning from experience, from thinking about what has happened in the past; these problems are solved by using the accumulated wisdom of the profession. These distinctions may be useful as we go through the details of the various problems of beginning teachers.

PHASE ONE - THE PROBLEMS OF THE FIRST DAY OF TEACHING

It is moot whether the initial problems are those of the first day or of the weeks immediately preceding the first day of teaching. Here we are treating the problems in two parts, one part being how to get ready for the first day, and the other part being the actual day itself. We think that the problems of the first day looming large in the mind of the beginning teacher affect how that teacher thinks in the weeks immediately before the first day. We think that in the mind of the beginning teacher the problems perceived at this time are those of the first day. It seems to us unlikely that the teacher is visualizing many long-term problems; perhaps some, such as the bigger problems of how I will grade students, what kinds of tests will I give, but in general the teacher in the weeks immediately preceding the beginning of school will most likely be focused on what happens on the first day of school.

It will be useful for the reader to keep in mind that some of these problems occur whether one is a beginner or not. All teachers do have to get ready for the beginning of school. The difference for the beginning teacher is that he or she is meeting this first day of school for the first time. Therefore, having had no or limited experience on which to rely, everything that happens prior to the beginning of school is for the beginning teacher a new problem.

The Specific Problems of This Phase

The two problems in this phase are how to handle the first day and how to get ready for the first day and the ensuing period. They are on their own entirely for the first time with no one to bail them out if they run into difficulty.

The view of beginning teachers of the start of school seems to be one of two kinds. They are afraid of a number of likely problems, such as they will lose control of the class, they will not interest students, they will create or generate negative attitudes in the pupils, they will be asked questions they cannot answer, they will lose track of where they are, they will be confounded and confused. Obviously such fears are fears of the unknown, fears arising from unsureness about one's self, and from lack of experience with the events about to be met.

The other view of the first day is a completely unrealistic one. The teacher anticipates a student body which rarely exists an enthusiastic, interested group, eager to learn from the teacher, and well prepared for what the teacher is about to present to them. This type of anticipation is usually characteristic of high school teachers who for some reason seem to think that many of their students will be like them or like they have imagined themselves to be, that is, dedicated students. Obviously this lack of realism is likely to lead to difficulties and is certain to lead to disappointment and frustration.

But these two different views present two different kinds of problems. The first view is essentially the thinking of a fearful person suffering from anxiety and apprehension. The problem to be solved is how to relieve the anxiety of the individual. Such anxiety is not likely to disappear until after the person has experienced the first day, and if this first experience is positive, the anxiety will disappear. There are, however, ways of coping with unknown events which utilize general life skills, but we usually do not instruct on these particular skills in teacher preparation programs. The beginning teacher therefore must rely on his or her own resources for dealing with these complex unknown events.

There are some routines that beginning teachers can use that are used by experienced teachers. Some experienced teachers advise being over prepared and thoroughly prepared for the first day. Their advice is "begin with a bang"; start in a business-like way, continue in a business-like way, and if you have too much material, do not be concerned; it is better to be over prepared than to run out of material or activities. Such advice seems to be relatively sound, but our impression of training programs is that such practical advice may be given, but if it is, not at the time when it is most needed. In some places we suspect such pragmatic matters are relegated to school supervisors and administrators, which means that the beginning teacher may never get the advice.

Another suggestion made is that the teacher establish routines immediately and state the rules by which the class will be managed.

These rules cover such things as when one may leave one's desk to get materials, where to place things, how papers are to be collected, and how discussions are to be conducted. They also include assignment of tasks or chores, a very common practice in the elementary school.

These two pieces of advice may seem very ordinary, and one may ask why anyone would not do these things on their own. That is, of course, a very interesting question and the fact that there is no obvious answer was one of the issues that prompted us to begin thinking about how the stage of development of the person and their general experience in managing events affected how they taught the first day.

Ordinarily one would expect teachers to describe how they are going to manage the class. This way of introducing a new sequence of events is very common; beginning teachers have observed other people doing it; they have some idea of its value from their own experiences. But many beginning teachers get off to a very confused, bumbling kind of start which to the observer suggests that they do not know what they are doing. The consequence frequently is disorder and disorder that continues well beyond the first day so that the teacher's worst fears are in fact confirmed. But unfortunately they do not see that it is their behavior which is producing the causes of their fear, and that these causes could be removed by their actions.

The lack of realism in their views of students is a problem to which beginning teachers refer repeatedly. They use the term "expectations". They say that their expectations were unrealistic or idealistic or too theoretical. They use a variety of synonyms all of which mean that they misperceived what their students were like but the labels tell us nothing about why they held these misperceptions. This problem is a puzzling one.

Many assume that since beginning teachers are so near in age to some of the students they are teaching that they would have some feeling for what these students were like, but apparently differences of only a few years make for larger cultural differences in a society where change is occurring all the time. But then we may ask why they did not become familiar with students during their practice teaching, and again the lack of a convincing answer is particularly puzzling.

There is no good answer as to why beginning teachers are so remote from the students they are going to teach. Nor do the means which the colleges and universities use to familiarize them with the students seem to be very effective in this respect. The remedies seem rather obvious, and it is puzzling why such remedies have not been used. We suspect, and this is a point we will make repeatedly, that insufficient attention has been given to this problem and that the faculties of colleges and universities have little if any grasp of how serious it is for the beginning teacher.

It is not the problem that an experienced, professional teacher has; and faculty may think that the beginning teacher simply has to go through a phase where they learn about their pupils, and once they do, they will be able to work realistically with them. Certainly faculties stress the importance of adapting instruction to the characteristics of the pupil. In fact the beginning teacher is liable to think that this stress on individual programming for each child is unrealistic and too theoretical, and they certainly will regard it as impractical either from a management or an instructional point of view.

We see a peculiar situation. On the one hand the faculty is urging adaptation of instruction to individual characteristics, and one presumably would conclude that there is considerable variability in students if such importance is given to this. But this adaptation of instruction is regarded by the beginning teacher as unrealistic. On the other hand they seem to have no notion of the range of variation among their pupils in a variety of characteristics such as their ability and attitudes.

These two problems are the core problems with which the beginning teacher has to cope in the initial phase of moving into teaching. But they are not the only problems which the beginner faces. These other problems interact with these two core problems and the core problems influence how these other problems are solved.

Learning About What is to be Taught

The beginning teacher has two instructional problems. One is substantive in character, the other, instructional. First, there is the practical problem of the subject matter to be covered. Schools vary considerably in how specified their curricula are, and even in having available for teachers curriculum guides, lists of objectives, and other such materials that would tell the teacher the general outline and focus of what is to be taught. The less material that is available, the more indeterminant the situation is from the viewpoint of the beginning teacher. He or she knows that in some way what they are doing is integrated with or related to the work of other teachers, and therefore is likely to be concerned about what they are to cover. Without guidance they have no way of knowing.

Another problem is how to present the materials and content of instruction. Here the beginning teacher is probably concerned about the appropriate level of instruction, how to make the content interesting, and how to sustain this interest. Some curriculum materials might provide guides. The beginning teachers, if they are not too shy, can ask an experienced teacher for some advice. But the beginning teacher has to deal with the concrete reality of a specific body of knowledge or skill to be taught to a particular group of pupils, and he or she has to learn how to do that. They are not usually prepared for the specifics of this task, though they may have been trained in general ideas and concepts that are relevant to it. These materials have to be selected and organized by the teacher and arranged into a concrete and specific sequence of instruction.

Beginning teachers do not usually know how to do this task very well, and again it is puzzling as to why they do not since they typically have had some experience with organizing. It may be that they are as good at the task as they are likely to be given the limited amount of experience they have in practice teaching. But the beginning teacher will struggle with this problem of adapting the materials of instruction to his or her particular class again and again.

One serious problem that occurs all too frequently is that the the beginning teachers may not be prepared for the subjects which they are to teach; this occurs mainly at the high school and junior high school level. Although a beginning teacher may be assigned a class in history, for example, it may be an area of history in which he or she has had relatively little previous course work. The teacher therefore has to prepare in depth while teaching the subject, and most certainly will feel insecure until familiar with the subject matter. English teachers experience this problem frequently because they have to teach reading materials that they themselves have not read.

These problems are soluble in large part in the teacher preparation program, but they seem to have persisted for years. They are not entirely resolvable because teaching assignments are likely to be made which are less than ideal. It seems that there ought to be more practical ways for getting teachers ready for subjects with which they are unfamiliar. Would it not be possible, for example, for the teacher to have the assignment sufficiently in advance, say two or three weeks in advance, so that they could do much of the reading required prior to the beginning of school?

The beginning teacher is usually totally dedicated to being well prepared and feels the need to be thoroughly informed. There appear to be two motives for this behavior of thorough and comprehensive preparation which is apparent among beginning teachers. One motive is the desire to be ready for all contingencies. The beginning teachers are afraid that they will be asked questions which they cannot answer resulting in embarrassment and ridicule. Of course they see any problematic situation, no matter what its magnitude, as a potential source of disruption that will lead quickly to a loss of control over the class. Experienced teachers have sufficient security to be able to say to students that they do not know something but will look it up, or will use ways to have the students seek the information for themselves.

The other motive is that the beginning teacher wants to do a good job of teaching. To teach well, one must be prepared. If one does not know about certain aspects of a topic, or has a relatively superficial familiarity with it, or has not studied the topic in some time, one has a sense of being unready for the task of presenting the material to others.

There is little question that concern about preparation is a major fear or source of anxiety of beginning teachers. In an unpublished study the faculty at Stanford University queried the interns on a variety of topics about their teaching, some of which pertained to the amount of time they were spending preparing for the classes which they were teaching. The answers to this question were unbelievable when they were first put together. The interns reported spending on the average 40 to 60 hours a week preparing for their classes. This number seemed all the more unbelievable because they taught two or three classes but not a full schedule. This number was checked by interviewing the interns, and after the interviews there was no reason to disbelieve their statements about the amount of time they were spending preparing for their classes. The cause was one of those we described above; they had not read the literature which they were assigning to pupils, or they were teaching a course in which they themselves had had only one course or too much time had passed since their preparation.

One conclusion we can be reasonably clear about at this time, is that the preparation for the beginning of school, in particular, and for the first six months or so is a problem for the beginning teacher. This problem has three aspects: (1) they need to know what to prepare; (2 they need to prepare it; (3) they need time for this preparation. Attempting to prepare in depth and thoroughly while learning about the school and learning about teaching imposes a burden on the beginning teacher which appears to be largely unnecessary.

There are special problems with respect to preparation that cannot be anticipated in the teacher preparation program but which school districts might provide help on. Some school districts have a highly structured curriculum which must be followed fairly closely by all teachers in the system. There is no way a teacher can learn this curriculum without some course of preparation. We observed such a situation in Jefferson County, Colorado. The school district there had set a series of regular meetings with all new teachers in the district, mostly beginning teachers, in which members of the supervisory staff presented what was to be taught, discussed problems in teaching, and gave the beginning teachers whatever advice and assistance they could. We have discussed this district's program in our report on the site visits in Volume Two.

This system seemed to work fairly well, but we have the impression that if some of the course work had been done more in advance of the beginning of school that some teachers would have felt more secure and perhaps would have had a better start than they seemed to feel that they had. We have no objective evidence as to how well they were doing other than what individual teachers told us. They liked the training they were receiving, they had suggestions for improving it, and they recognized its need. Their obvious insecurity in working with the new system came, we think, in part from their unfamiliarity with the system and from its complexity. The curriculum was a detailed comprehensive curriculum on which even experienced teachers had to work hard to learn and to use efficiently.

The beginning teacher may have therefore two problems. One, they may not be well prepared to meet their own standards, but they may also have to learn curriculum which requires considerable knowledge. The newness and complexity of the curriculum in a particular school should be recognized as a critical factor in the perceptions of the beginning teachers of their problems. No matter how staid, ordinary or conventional the curriculum may in fact be, to the beginning teacher it is a new domain. The problems of the beginner are further complicated when the curriculum is complex, diverse and original.

Learning About School Rules and Policies

Most school districts have orientation programs, and the principals meet with teachers before the beginning of school. The general sessions usually cover personnel matters as well as being informative about school district goals. The principal may or may not have a handbook of rules and policies; the principal may or may not have a separate meeting with beginning or new teachers. However these orientation matters are handled by the district or by the school, the beginning teacher may be less concerned about the specific rules and policies and be more concerned about the beginning of class and preparation for class. The teacher, therefore, is not likely to assimilate all of this information easily.

Some of the rul , the beginning teacher must know, such as the practices with respect to taking attendance. Some need not be known immediately, but the beginning teacher has to be alerted to when he or she will need to know about them. Examples in this category are the procedures for visits with parents about their children.

The problems of beginning teachers are those of any teacher entering a new system, but the experienced teacher knows that schools generally function much alike, knows what to ask about, and knows where to look for variations or exceptions. Eventually the beginning teacher will know enough about the procedures and rules so that they do not cause trouble for him or her. But since most beginning teachers want to get off to a good start, they want to know what rules they must follow. Some rules are critical to observe from the first day, such as procedures for checking in and out, the time the teacher is to be present in the school, and the time they may leave.

The orientation of teachers to specific rules and procedures has two aspects, the formal and the informal. It seems obvious how to inform beginning teachers about the formal rules. The methods currently used could be substantially improved at relatively little expense, and this improvement would alleviate or obviate problems for the beginning teacher. The principal can make a point of talking with each beginning teacher and seeing what they want to know about; or an assistant principal can perform a similar and related function. The beginning teachers can be assigned to a senior teacher who could inform them about the rules and regulations. Meetings can be held on specific topics.

Learning the informal system is more likely to take time and the beginning teacher is not likely to learn it very easily and quickly. The informal rules are the unstated rules, the rules that have to be observed even though they are not in writing. We learn about informal rules and policies from those who have been in the system for some time.

The beginning teacher is usually quite isolated at the beginning of the school year and therefore has few ways of learning what these informal rules and procedures are. Sometimes the teacher representative or chapter chairperson provides information of this kind. But the system does not formally designate someone to provide the informal information. The beginning teacher needs some kind of resource which will guide him or her to learn the informal rules, regulations and policies.

The use of terms like "rules" and "regulations" may seem strange when they are referred to as "informal rules" since the very nature of a rule is to be specific, concrete and public. We are talking about rule-like statements which are made by individuals who communicate the essence of what is to be done, and who make clear that the expectation is that it will be done. Such "informal rules" exist in all organizations and in some cases are more potent influences on behavior than the formal rules. Ignoring them runs the risk of incurring the displeasure or wrath of an administrator or colleague. Peristent ignoring of these informal rules usually is punished by isolating the offender.

The beginning teacher has to be inducted gradually into this system. What the beginner will hear are various perspectives on what this informal system requires -- "What the school is like". The beginner is probably insensitive or uninformed about the quality and reliability of the sources of information to which he or she is exposed. Therefore the beginner's problem is complicated by not knowing whom to believe or the degree of belief which should be extended to statements about what is expected of teachers in that school.

This may well be a problem for which training and related systems have no solution. To communicate what the informal system is means that somebody would have had to study it in detail and pass on the information about it in a formal way. Such is not likely to happen. But the beginning teacher could be paired with an experienced teacher, could meet with experienced teachers who would talk to him or her about "what the school is like", and in these ways make it possible for the beginner to get a picture of the informal system and more precise information about it.

But the problem will persist over time, though it is acute at the beginning of the school year, and probably will be solved only by accumulating experience. What is more important is that the beginning teacher be made sensitive to the existence of such informal systems and be taught typical ways of finding information about it. This kind of knowledge can be provided and it may be possible to do some skill training in the informal systems of which the teacher-in-preparation is a part. Sensitivity to such systems and sensitivity to the sources of bias in them is a characteristic of individuals who are successful at adapting to systems, and more attention could be given to acquiring these skills in teacher preparation programs. It is probable that informal systems are discussed in teacher preparation programs, but since the trainee is not in the system of a particular school nor is his or her instructor, the concrete application of these ideas must wait until the teacher has begun actual teaching. But perhaps emphasis on the skills required to learn about the informal system would be a useful kind of preparation.

Learning About Physical Locations

There are a variety of locations of places, persons, equipment that the beginning teacher must learn. Many of these are learned quickly. But people who are knowledgeable may have forgotten what it was like to be there for the first time. It seems to us that it would be possible to put together in any school a list of where things are and to distribute them to new teachers, and to walk them around the school so they became familiar with places. Many schools will do this, and part of the problem may be that the beginning teacher's attention is focused on other kinds of problems so that they do not pay sufficient attention to where things are located.

This kind of a problem seems easily resolved, and there is no reason for the beginning teacher to be wandering around looking for what he or she needs. Perhaps the solution is for each new teacher in a school to make up a list of what they needed to find when they first came into the school and the administration of the school would then use this list to construct some orientation activities

These kinds of problems seem relatively minor. They have no great theoretical interest, they seem remote from instruction, and they are the kinds of things that are learned in time by most reasonably adept people. We need first of all to get some empirical information on the degree to which a problem of finding one's way around the school is a critical or disturbing problem for a beginning teacher. What did they need to find, could they find it, and when they did not, what was the consequence? These are the core kinds of empirical questions that are relatively easily answered and whose answers would give us some notion of the degree to which unfamiliarity with the physical arrangement of the school makes life more difficult for the beginning teacher.

It may be that problems of this kind do not have an immediate serious consequence. But they may be one of several problems that when added together make life unpleasant, unnecessarily difficult and confusing for the beginner. Our position is that as many of these easily solvable problems ought to be eliminated wherever possible. If the beginning teacher is a bumbler or cannot find his or her way anywhere, the problem is of a different order of magnitude; but if they are simply lost because nobody has told them where certain things are, that kind of a problem can be obviated.

Feelings About the Beginning of School

One of the more interesting potential studies is the study of what kinds of feelings beginning teachers have as they begin teaching. Ryan's book of diaries of beginning teachers, gives us a very good idea of what a small sample of teachers was thinking and feeling as they began their first year of teaching. We need much more information of this kind and particularly information about how various circumstances affect the feelings and thoughts of the beginning teacher at the start of school in their first year of teaching.

We do have sufficient information to identify at least several different kinds of concerns that are the source of feelings of anxiety, fear, and which pose threats to one's self-esteem. The most important of these is perhaps the beginning teachers' fears about their job-security. They are beginning a new job and know they will be evaluated. They know that if at the end of three years, for example, they have been evaluated positively, they will achieve tenure in their school district. Also if they do well in the school, they are likely to remain in it if they want to. The rewards for doing well in initial teaching are substantial in terms of job-security.

The beginning teacher knows that if they have many problems in conducting their classes well that their job-security will be threatened.

So their minds are set to do as well as they possibly can in circumstances which are quite strange to them. Realistically not every difficulty or problem is a threat to job-security, but in the mind of a highly anxious individual, concerned about doing well, even the smallest threats are magnified.

Complicating the problems of beginning teachers is the lack of evaluative information about how they are doing. Depending on how the principal manages visiting the beginning teacher, the beginning teacher may have some help from the principal or none at all. Other teachers are obviously very busy with their own classes and at best can talk to the beginning teacher during preparation periods or lunches but are not going to be able to observe the beginning teacher and offer suggestions or evaluations. The beginning teacher, like all other teachers, is isolated during most of the school day and therefore is dependent solely on his or her own resources for determining how well he or she is doing. If teaching does not seem to be going well, the beginner is highly likely to be threatened in the fundamental way of fearing for their job.

Contrast the situation of the beginning teacher with that of the experienced teacher. The experienced teacher does have the security of tenure, has solved many of the problems of the beginning teacher, and knows the relative importance of certain kinds of difficulties. The experienced teacher knows that there will be some students in class who will present problems, but he or she has met these problems before and has habits and methods for coping with these problems. The experienced teachers may not be all that successful in coping with these problems but the methods are usually adequate enough so that difficulties are not translated into threats to their job.

__Fear of immediate failure in teaching__: Most beginning teachers seem to be filled with dread that what they will do in class will "boomerang" and lead to loss of control of the class. They seem to be projecting potential disaster as they anticipate the beginning of teaching. Fear of failure is a particularly debilitating fear unless the beginning teacher is realistic about how he or she might fail and what he or she can do to prevent it.

We are not certain but that this kind of fear characterizes all beginning professionals. One of us has worked with another group of professionals, nurses, and interviewed them immediately upon graduation. These recent graduates also expressed considerable concern about the harm they might do to patients. In the case of the nurses and beginning teachers the cause seems to be the same way; they feel insufficiently prepared. In some cases this fear is realistic -- they are insufficiently prepared; in other cases the fear has other origins.

The problem is that the beginning teacher does not know how well prepared he or she is. They have not really tested their capacities as teachers, and they have faced only a limited range of problems particularly if their practical preparation has been exclusively practice teaching.

One of the problems we will be pointing to continually as we go through these descriptions of problems is how lack of familiarity, lack of experience, lack of opportunity to test one's capacities produce feelings that are debilitating, and give rise to perceptions of one's self as incompetent, untrained, and likely to be a failure. Most observers point to the lack of practical experience in teacher preparation programs as the reason why teachers do not have adequate skills. This observation has undoubted validity, but we do not pay sufficient attention to another fact, and that is how the lack of experience affects the feelings of security and confidence in the work of teaching. Even if teachers have been trained on certain kinds of skills, they may not have performed teaching tasks sufficiently so that they feel comfortable in using these skills to anticipate and resolve difficulties however they may occur.

We do not know whether the beginning teacher will have acquired sufficient skill to be comfortable. We are reasonably certain that those who have had only practice teaching or a minimal amount of practical work in classes beyond practice teaching are likely to feel insecure. The internship obviates this problem by incorporating, in part, the first year of teaching under supervision. The problem with the internship is that it is not an exact parallel to the first year of teaching; it is itself a training experience and the intern is likely to have the fears of failure which are very realistic because they have had no training or very little training prior to actual teaching.

Feelings of isolation: The beginning teacher most likely does not know any of the staff of the school into which he or she moves, and also may be new in the community so that he or she has few if any friends or even acquaintances. The beginning teacher does not have a readily available support system. In fact he or she has been removed from the supports that were previously available such as friends and classmates.

This social isolation coincides with the beginning of a new job and must make adaptation to that job more difficult in many ways. The beginning teacher has no one to turn to for advice or consolation except other teachers whom he or she does not know well or at all.

We know little about the effects of this social condition of the beginning teacher. The experience may be so common and has been survived by so many people that its significance is underrated. It may be that many beginning teachers make a relatively easy adaptation to this kind of change. But we suspect that it is more of a hidden problem because the opportunity to talk about it has not been available. Nor does one readily admit to feelings of loneliness, homesickness, fear of living alone, so that even when teachers are queried about their problems, they may not refer to this category of problems. We do know that concern is expressed about "social opportunities" which usually means opportunities for dating or companionship.

Certainly there is evidence of the general social isolation of teachers in their professional work. Many observers of teaching have pointed out that teachers interact most of the day with young people or children and rarely have an opportunity to interact with other adults. (See Lortie, 1975). The general condition of the teacher is exacerbated for the beginning teacher because even the most elemental forms of social relations have to be developed by the beginner.

We stress the importance of studying this point because of a more comprehensive point that we have made repeatedly throughout this report. This point can be best stated in the form of a question, "How much of the problems of beginning teachers are influenced by the kinds of developmental changes which are occurring in their life at the beginning of their teaching career?" Major life adjustments such as shifts from being a student to taking on one's first job is a major life change, and attendent upon it are a variety of problems with which a person has to cope. Some of these problems arise from the nature of the work itself, others arise from the nature of the change. It is this latter category of problems to which we point in this section.

The nature of the change from student to teacher, from young adult relatively free of responsibilities to young adult with major responsibilities; from college to the school; from the college community to the school community; from living in a social group to living alone. These are changes which may require more adaptive skill than learning to teach successfully, as fraught as this latter adaptation is itself with problems.

Complicating Events

We have pointed to two major categories of change which beginning teachers are undergoing at the initiation of their teaching careers. One category of change relates to learning how to cope with the problems of teaching, the problems of instruction and evaluation of pupils; the other, to the social changes which are occurring in the life of the teacher. In some ways these problems are interrelated. Here we wish to point to factors in the context in which the beginning teacher starts to teach which may exacerbate any or all of these problems.

These factors may vary from school to school, and are not necessarily characteristic of the situations of all beginning teachers. They are factors which are of two kinds, those which arise from outside the teacher, and those which are unique to some teachers.

Complications from external agents: Some complications are obvious and well-known such as the failure of the school administration to make teaching assignments sufficiently early so that the teacher can use some of the summer months to get ready for class. If the teacher learns his or her assignment early in the first week of school or immediately before the opening of school, he or she does not have time to prepare adequately for the first day and week of school. Similarly a teacher may be assigned subjects for which he or she has less preparation than other subjects in the curriculum.

If materials of instruction are available, the teacher has to adapt. This is difficult for experienced teachers and is particularly difficult for inexperienced and beginning teachers.

Usually the district provides some form of orientation for the beginning teachers, and there are the opening of school sessions for all teachers. Principals in the teachers' schools may also provide their own orientation meetings. Assimilation of all of this new information will be difficult for the beginning teacher no matter how it is presented. But poor orientation programs complicate the teachers' adaptation to the new environment. The beginning teacher needs to know where various kinds materials of instruction can be found and the kinds of people he or she can call on for help. The teacher needs to be physically oriented to the layout of the school, including such minor matters as where parking spaces are available or how to get from public transportation to the school in the most convenient and safest way. These are among the many details of information that will help the beginning teacher feel more secure.

The substance of an orientation program is relatively easy to determine. All that is needed is that a group of teachers new to a school, particularly beginning teachers, be asked to describe what information they need as they begin the school year. A relatively simple research problem would be to interview beginning teachers at various points in time to assess what information they are looking for.

We have touched on some rather seemingly simple kinds of needs for direction and information and for good administrative practice. These matters seem so mundane to the experienced person that their importance may be overlooked. But it is necessary to look at the world from the point of view of the beginning teacher. The beginning teacher is a stranger in a new land, the territory of which and whose rules and customs and culture are unknown, but who has to assume a significant role in that society. If the problem is put in this manner, it is easy to see that we are studying a general problem in human experience as well as a particular problem in adaptation to a specific institution and to a specific social role.

Complicating events inside the beginning teacher: The beginning teachers in any cadre will vary considerably in the degree to which they possess adaptive characteristics. Some of these individuals will be highly susceptible to the stress of a new situation and may respond maladaptively. We have heard descriptions from beginning teachers of physical reactions to these first days of teaching that ought not be ignored, particularly if they are more general than we have been able to sample. The beginning teachers have told us of vomiting before class in the morning; others speak of the tenseness which they feel; others describe their fatigue at the end of each school day. One or more of these symptoms are characteristic apparently of most beginning teachers. Their descriptions or problems are filled with references to the symptoms of anxiety and fear.

But it seems likely that some beginning teachers are better able to handle stress than others. Those who have less confidence in their ability to cope with the new teaching situations, who are panicked by it, and who are living on the edge of terror have a special problem in adjusting. We know of no simple solution for ameliorating the effects of these personal characteristics. We know that many people are able to master these reactions and to become effective teachers. Others, however, create a situation which exacerbates their fear, and they eventually fail in teaching.

So little is said about these reactions in the written literature that we are struck by the curiosity of these omissions. It may be that beginning teachers are reluctant to admit to such fear in writing, or it may be that the investigators have not asked the questions which would prompt revelations about their problems in coping with their fears. Most of the research is relatively antiseptic in its descriptions of the intensity of feeling which individual teachers will express when spoken to face-to-face about their experiences in the first days of teaching.

We have therefore a twofold problem, one of assessing the range and variety of emotional reactions to the early days of teaching, particularly the first day; and two, assessing the limits beyond which the fear and anxiety becomes so debilitating that the beginning teacher is ineffective in conducting the most ordinary aspects of instruction and managing classes. We know problems exist because of the emotional intensity of this first day, but we know very little about the origins of this anxiety other than that the first day of class is seen as a particularly threatening event and is always seen as of major significance, and whose mastery is regarded as critical for success. Certainly events which are perceived in this manner are significant life events, but very little attention has been paid in previous research to this emotional significance and its many ramifications in the life of the teacher.

Another problem referred to above in a somewhat different context is associated with individuals, not necessarily the initiation into the profession. Some individuals may have too many things going on in their life to cope successfully with another major stress filled set of events. There is no way that the system can be organized so that people arrange their lives neatly, nor does anyone have the authority to tell other people how to live, but certainly some people beginning to teach have problems in teaching because of other events in their life.

Significant Analyses Needed

We have touched here briefly on some of the data about beginning teachers that need to be gathered and understood. We have pointed particularly to two aspects of the life of the beginning teacher that need descriptive research and analysis. One of these is the character of the stressful situation of the first day of teaching. Little is known about the symbolic significance of this day, other than it is seen as highly significant to the individual. We do not know why it has such great significance, though it is not difficult to speculate as to why. We know very little, however, about the dynamics of this significance. Is this initial day seen as a test of one's ability to cope with difficult life situations; is it a test of one's ego-identity; is it a test of one's values and ideals (enough has been said by beginning teachers to suggest that this question is a focal question)?

The other aspect of these events which need study is the interaction among them, how they influence each other, and which ones are prepotent in terms of their influence. This seems to be a rather obvious kind of analysis, and therefore its omission from previous research is all the more surprising. But any judgments about what kinds of help a beginning teacher needs at the beginning of his or her career depends upon understanding how various elements in the life of the beginning teacher affect teaching effectiveness. Beginning teachers may be very well trained on management and instructional tactics and strategies, but are so debilitated by fear or so disorganized by the many problems in life with which they have to cope that they do not use what they have been trained to use.

We cannot automatically conclude that the general ineffectiveness and floundering of the beginning teacher is solely due to a lack of adequate preparation. Certainly some of the beginning teachers' floundering at the beginning of their career is due to lack of adequate preparation in some fundamentals of instruction. Some of it is due to lack of proper organization so that the beginning teacher is prepared for the subjects which they are to teach. Some of it is due to the lack of adequate support at the time that they are teaching- support in the form of prescriptive advice on how to cope with certain kinds of problems in the classes in the school. But an unknown portion derives from the characteristics of the life and personality of the individuals who are beginning teachers. About these latter aspects we know the least, yet there is reason to believe that for certain individuals these may be the most critical set of factors influencing how they adapt to the processes of beginning to teach.

We are sorting out the problems along another major set of dimensions. One dimension is preparation. Along this dimension problems are seen as having arisen because the individual has not learned how to cope with certain kinds of teaching situations or does not have adequate skills for handling certain kinds of teaching situations.

Another dimension of these problems describes the influence of the context of the problems on the effectiveness of the beginning teacher. Here failure to provide the beginning teacher with appropriate orientation, or to make sensible assignments of beginning teachers to classes or giving teachers the most difficult students in the school to teach are all instances of events that complicate teaching for any teacher, and particularly for the beginning teacher.

The third dimension relates to the emotions and attitudes of the individuals who are the beginning teachers. Along this dimension are those intrapersonal factors or variables which describe the personality of the beginning teacher. These variables or factors influence how the beginning teacher would react to any kind of new situation. These attitudes and emotions are in part the result of the kinds of life experience which the beginning teacher has had and may be the least amenable to the formal training procedures of the preservice program.

If the problems of beginning teachers can be seen as a product of factors along these three dimensions, then it should be possible to describe first the factors on each dimension which affect the effectiveness of the beginning teacher, which reduce their sense of security and self-confidence or enhance them. It should also be possible to determine for various types of beginning teachers the degree to which factors on these different dimensions coalesce. We ought to be able to describe different beginning teachers as being influenced by different combinations of factors on these three dimensions.

We might, for example, find that some beginning teachers are almost exclusively influenced by their emotions and attitudes. No amount of previous preparation is likely to get them through the early days of teaching because they are more likely to be overwhelmed by their internal emotional dynamics than by either their available skills or the context in which they are teaching.

The factors associated with the context may be disruptive for any teacher but more so for the beginning teachers because they do not have some readily adaptable skills for coping with unplanned situations. Training in this case ought to be more helpful. Obviously the factors associated with the first dimension, those which represent various kinds of preparation for teaching, are those which are most under the control of the training institution. But until we know the relative importance of factors on each of these dimensions, can describe the factors themselves, and can find the extent to which these various factors are correlated in the problems of beginning teachers, we have very little understanding of what is happening to the beginning teacher and above all why it is happening.

Further, we have no real idea of how to resolve the problems the beginning teacher faces through a better preparation; nor do we know if we can resolve all problems through preparation -- we suspect that we cannot, and that some of the problems of beginning teachers will always occur as long as individuals are selected and accepted into the programs of teacher preparation who have personality characteristics that affect how they adapt to teaching and how they will teach. This latter problem is a problem from which the training institutions have generally shied away, or when they have been selective, have been selective largely on personality dimensions related to aptitude and intellectual achievement. There is much rhetoric in the literature about the importance of "personality factors" in teaching, and historically there have been studies of the influence of these factors on teaching that have not been too productive. Perhaps a change in methodology might make this study more productive. By a change in methodology we mean study the situations in which the influence of personality factors are most likely to be paramount and where their influence can be seen directly.

Previous research on the influence of personality factors on teaching has been largely done by giving personality tests and relating the results of these tests to measures of teaching effectiveness or measures of the teacher's teaching style. This methodology seems somewhat remote from the realities of how personality influences particular events. We are therefore proposing that a more detailed, direct, person-to-person study be done of beginning teachers in such a way that the influence of their stable and predominant personality characteristics and how they adapt in the beginning of teaching can be identified and followed.

Summary

We have spent considerable space on describing the problems of what we have called the first day of teaching. This much attention to this first day is justifiable because the first day in many ways symbolizes the critical problems of the beginning teacher.

The fear of the beginning teacher does not disappear at the end of the first day; it may in fact be increased by the experiences of the first day. The feelings of stress and the reactions to them do not disappear though they may be attenuated if the first day is successful.

But of all the events of the year, the first day of school is probably the most critical and significant. It sets the tone and style of instruction of the beginning teacher. First impressions have been made, and the teacher's feelings of power and control are strongly influenced by what happens on this day.

We are not suggesting that what happens on the first day is irremediable or determines everything which happens. It most certainly does not, but it presumably has a strong influence on the rest of the year.

We should note again that the statements we are making in these last few sentences essentially are hypothetical, and their factual basis in careful empirical research is slim. We are relying on what we have heard from teachers and on our observations of beginning teachers more than the available literature. It may be that we are exaggerating the importance of this first day. Clearly a problem for research is to determine how what happens in the first day and in the first week and in the earliest days of the year sets the stage for the teacher's development and improvement throughout the year, how that first day influences children's perceptions of the teacher and their reactions to him or her, and how instruction is affected through the year.

We make these precautionary remarks because the next phase is really an elaboration and a continuation of what has begun on the first day of school.

PHASE TWO - THE FIRST WEEKS OF SCHOOL

The first week of school needs to be identified as a critical stage in the adaptation of the beginning teacher to teaching because each successive day compounds and complicates the problems of the first day. The teacher has to be prepared for the second day of the week, the third day of the week, the second week of school, and this preparation adds to the problem of being ready for the initial day of school. A teacher with a poor sense of direction and of organization is going to run into serious problems even if he or she manages to be prepared for the first day.

The second aspect is that each successive day has consequences on following days in the management of the class. Serious mistakes in management tend to compound the teacher's difficulties and are not always easily remedied, partly because the teacher does not perceive them as the sources of his or her problems. Also a certain amount of testing apparently goes on in these early days of teaching. The pupils assess whether teachers are serious about the rules they have set, whether they will keep their word, whether they will back up their threats, whether or not they will enforce the routines that they have established.

For all of these reasons what is happening to the beginning teacher during the first and second week of school probably constitutes a distinctive phase different from the emotional high of the first day of classes. At least for the purposes of the analysis presented here, and because teachers pointed to certain characteristics of this period we have chosen to identify it as a separate phase distinctive in some respects from what has happened on the first day of school.

Continuing Problems

As has been stated above, some problems continue and develop, are resolved, merge with other problems, but essentially remain as strands of problems which dominate these earliest days of teaching. Many of them are the perennial problems of teaching, some of which the beginning teacher learns to solve and carries that experience with him or her through his or her teaching career. Others have to be solved repetitively each year as the teacher meets new groups of students. Some problems occur only because of the particular period of life at which the beginning teacher happens to be. But whatever category these problems may fall into, they persist through the earliest days of teaching and through a substantial portion of the first year. If not solved, they are problems which create extraordinary difficulties for most teachers.

Instructional problems: The preparation of materials is a continuing problem that lasts well through the first year. The demands of the preparation vary by what the teacher is teaching. Eventually most teachers reach a point where they are sufficiently prepared. They have done sufficient preparation in the past and are ready for successive teaching situations. Consider the teacher of first year algebra in the high school. He or she has to prepare the instructions on the concepts and methods in algebra. Usually the teacher has to work out most if not all of the problems in the text. Once this has been done, the teacher is basically prepared for a major portion of the instruction in that particular subject.

The beginning teacher at this point begins to experience the complexities of more extensive planning. He or she could get through the first week on a day by day basis, but beyond the first week the teacher must begin some form of longer range planning. The teacher must also continue to find the time for the extensive preparation that is frequently required of the new teacher. The beginning teacher now has a little more perspective on how far in advance he or she needs to plan, even if it is only the recognition that the planning has to be something more than being ahead of the student minute by minute.

The beginning teacher also has a considerable amount of paperwork, including paperwork related to seemingly irrelevant activities. The bureaucratic system of the school, the district, the state or of various kinds of programs will require the teacher to process paper. The requirements of the task are largely unknown to the teacher, and the tasks may be seen as interfering with what the teacher regards as the really important work of instruction.

Sometime in this first month the beginning teacher will have to meet parents in an open-house. Since most school systems invite parents early in the school year, the beginning teacher will have to develop a preparation, give that preparation, and talk to some parents even if very briefly. This is the first public occasion at which the beginning teacher will be displayed. The teacher is concerned about the impression he or she will make on parents, his or her ability to inspire their confidence, whether his or her "newness" will be showing, and whether the parents are likely to be cooperative and supportive.

The beginning teacher has no idea how parents act in such situations, or if they will even show up for the occasion. He or she has some idea from what other teachers say, but this seemingly important public relations activity is another source of stress and anxiety for the beginning teacher and a test of his or her ability to cope with the unknown.

Reactions and Feelings During This Second Phase

As far as we can determine the kinds of fears and anxieties that characterize the beginning of school persist as the beginning teacher begins to settle into the job of teaching. The beginning teacher knows that each day is potentially a source of problems in management, and during each day the teacher has to be prepared to conduct the class.

It is during this time that the beginning teacher may develop highly effective ways of managing pupils, or may hit upon a particular technique which he or she will then continue to use almost superstitiously. The beginners' expectations about pupils are undergoing a transformation at this time and in some sense they are probably setting for the future their ideas of what pupils are like and what can be expected of them.

Phase Two is a transitional stage out of the overwhelming fear and anxiety of the first days of school into the basis of work of the year. By the end of the first month of school the beginning teacher will have established some form of control over the class so that major disruptions do not occur and so that pupils are basically task-oriented most of the time. By the end of the first month the beginning teachers have learned who the various pupils are by name, some basic information about each pupil, and may have met their parents. The teachers will have presented themselves to pupils and to the parents; they will have created an impression of the kind of person and teacher they are. They will have learned the basic rules of the school, and will be able to get themselves around the school reasonably well.

Again a little thought suggests that failure to reach these points leads to continuing disasters. Essentially this phase has been moving forward in the direction of being less lost in the school, being able to manage the pupils and doing the basic job of teaching. Failure to learn the necessary information or how to handle various problems in accordance with the rules of the school leaves the teachers more or less helpless. If they are not managing the day-by-day planning, they are in serious trouble. If they are having trouble pacing lessons by the end of this month, they are in serious trouble.

By contrast, if they do manage these tasks they have acquired the basic components of successful functioning as a teacher. They will be able to carry a lesson through from beginning to end. They will be prepared at least from one day to the next. They will be able to function reasonably well in living in the building.

They will have been left with a feeling of isolation, they will be coping with fears of showing that they are less than great teachers. But they will not be overwhelmed by these reactions, and will have begun the process of learning to live a life of isolated independence. The beginning teachers begin to move out of this phase as they develop greater skill in day-to-day planning and pacing of their lessons and as they become more skillful in maintaining control of their classes.

PHASE III - THE FIRST EXPERIENCES OF EVALUATING PUPILS

Somewhere in the time from the end of September or early October through to Thanksgiving the beginning teacher will have to engage in some form of major evaluative activity. In the elementary school this may be simply collecting information about their pupils from a variety of sources such as the worksheets that the pupils have completed, or from very simple tests they may have taken, or from the teacher's observations of them. In the secondary schools this may involve the giving of tests which the beginning teacher has to construct. In both cases the beginning teacher must make some kind of summary evaluative statement about their pupils and prepare grades.

This first confrontation with the evaluative role presents the beginning teacher with two kinds of problems, one psychological and the other technical. The technical problem is simply a problem of accumulating information in a sufficiently reliable form that they can make a valid judgment that they can support. The psychological problem is the problem of being an evaluator. The teacher may have established good working relations with the pupils, and fear that these relations will be jeopardized when he or she has to give grades or make summary judgments.

The other aspect of this problem which is psychological in character is that these teachers must be able to "defend" these judgments. The parents will be calling or coming to the school about the grades, and the pupils themselves will raise questions about the grades, or the administration may question some of the grades. The beginning teachers' judgments are being exposed to critical scrutiny, and the process, no matter how handled, will inevitably have its effect in anxiety and insecurity. The beginning teacher is experiencing a form of identity crisis at this point because his or her judgment may be questioned, and the teacher may be unsure of his or her own judgment.

Obviously beginning teachers can learn certain kinds of technical skills such as test construction and summarizing data in statistical ways which will help them establish a rational grading system. But this is only a partial solution to their bigger problem of having confidence both in their own judgments and in their ability to handle the consequences when these judgments are made.

Another major problem of this period is that the beginning teachers will have to talk to parents about their judgments. This exposes them to scrutiny as we have said, but it also places them in a situation where they have to interact with people that they know hardly at all. They may be exposed to some hostile reactions or forms of concern with which they do not know how to cope. They may be working with cooperative or uncooperative parents. They do not know how to anticipate the effect of their discussions with the parents on the pupils. The parents may go to the principal and complain about them. The parents may want them to change the grades. The parents may appeal to their sympathies in a variety of ways or give them information about the family situation which they will not know how to use very well.

Almost all beginning teachers state that they are poorly prepared to handle situations involving parents. As far as we can determine very little if any formal training is given in this respect, though experience with working with parents does occur as part of internship programs. But the experience in that case is much like the experience of the beginning teacher; the only advantage that the intern may have is the opportunity to discuss this problem with his supervisory teacher in the school or at the college or university.

Another major problem of this third phase is that the beginning teacher is likely to be observed and evaluated for the first time. The principal of the school usually will see a new teacher relatively early in the year and in fact may be required to do so by district policy. This occasion is likely to be highly threatening to the beginning teacher. He or she may have been having certain kinds of problems which are not yet resolved, and will be afraid that the principal will observe these problems and give a poor rating. Even if the teachers have matters reasonably under control, they know that they are inexperienced and are afraid of revealing weaknesses which others might see.

They of course have had no experience with how to interact with the principal in the context of an evaluation of this kind. Should they argue with him or her if they disagree? How do they accept the evaluation? Will it be helpful? Will the principal give them something to do that they will not be able to do?

The problem of beginning teachers is obviously how to react to an authority figure whose evaluations of them have significance for their future. This problem will recur, but is likely to be particularly intense for the beginning teacher because of newness in teaching and because this will be the first time they interact with the principal in this context. They may well be devastated by the results of this first interaction. They may be encouraged. They may be given clear directions or vague directions about what they ought to do to improve. Most of these consequences they can anticipate.

Further they may have information from other teachers about what to expect which may be more or less helpful. Again the beginning teacher is confronting a situation where he or she has relatively little personal resources to fall back on, a situation which is largely unknown and unpredictable.

The stress associated with evaluating their pupils can be resolved by a careful job of preparing their evaluations of pupils and by thinking through how they are going to react to parents and others who may question their evaluation system. But such preparations assume they have the relevant skills.

About this time the beginning teachers may begin to question what they are doing and how they are doing it. They may be more receptive to information and knowledge about teaching methods and the curriculum. But their scope is probably limited; they are more likely to be looking for specific and hopefully quick solutions to very concrete teaching problems. Since such solutions are not likely to be easily found and since they have little opportunity to talk with other teachers, they may feel considerable stress arising out of their frustrations.

Characteristics of the Third Phase

The third phase is characterized by the anxieties and stresses associated with evaluating and being evaluated and with beginning concerns about how to manage instruction most effectively. The beginning teacher may be devastated during this period by the results of his or her own evaluations of pupils or by the results of the evaluation of himself or herself by the principal. They are likely to be aware of their lack of skill in teaching and of their lack of knowledge about what is to be taught. Inevitably the beginning teacher will struggle with adapting instruction and the materials of instruction to the level of the pupils' interest and understanding.

They are now ready to move into the next stage of their personal development as a teacher, and they will be stimulated to move into this stage by their concern about what is to be taught and how to teach it. By the time they are into the second and third month, when they will have been evaluating pupils, they will be aware that not everything they are teaching is being learned.

They will have children in their class who are behind in the subject that they are teaching. They are now able to be concerned about the direction in which the class is going, and therefore what it is that these pupils really ought to be learning.

Apparently beginning teachers become aware about this time of the kind of system in which they are working. They had experienced relatively intense, and in some cases very intense, anxiety and fear, with which they have had to cope largely on their own. This aloneness impresses upon them the significance of the characteristic of which they now become very aware--that each teacher works largely in isolation. They have experienced a number of days during which they have little time to spend with other teachers. No one may have even come to their classroom except on minor errands. They have existed in their classroom with the students they teach; the rest of the world is apparently unaware of their fears or of the success that they are achieving in managing the situation of the first days of teaching.

They have also experienced how the teaching staff moves out of the school into their homes after school; that they are not available for discussion. They have experienced the lunch hour, preparation time, and interactions with other teachers that may not have been particularly helpful if they were characterized by complaining about students. The teachers' fears may have been exacerbated by these interactions.

Generally there is little in the social life of the school which they find helpful or supportive. We do not mean to imply that no one ever is interested in their problems, but reality is that other teachers are very busy themselves, and reality is that teachers have very little time to talk to each other.

The beginning teacher probably experiences for the first time a common fear, that of revealing weaknesses. If he or she is having difficulties managing, discussions of problems are not likely to be initiated by the beginning teacher who does not want other teachers or the administration to know that they are having problems.

This fear of talking to others about problems which they are having heightens their sense of isolation and obviously deprives them of the help that they need.

ACQUIRING COMPETENCE DURING THE FIRST MONTHS OF TEACHING

The entrance into teaching is traumatic for most beginning teachers. This critical experience is probably the most significant factor in determining the kind, the quality and the acquisition of effectiveness. If a beginning teacher masters the transition into teaching, he or she will survive as a teacher but may not be a very effective teacher. Many of these beginners may be very poor teachers, and whatever habits they have acquired in this survival period will probably persist through much of their teaching career.

The initial experience is also an unsupervised experience in almost every case. Some services are available to beginning teachers in some school districts, but the amount of this service is very small, and the quality is variable at best. The beginning teacher is on his or her own. What he or she learns is learned by trial and error. It is not surprising that the folklore of teaching is filled with cliches that sound like descriptions of superstitous behavior, such as, "Don't smile until Christmas." The beginning teacher tries something, it works (in some sense of the word), the beginning teacher clutches to this practice because it has helped him or her solve a problem. In later years such practices will be described to other teachers. Little critical judgment, if any, is exercised about why these particular practices work, whether they will work universally, or whether they have effects which are undesirable.

The thinking of the beginning teacher is suffused with anxiety and fear. He or she acts like a person who is in a very threatening situation for which they have had no relevant experience. What enables them to survive is valued, and since they remain in the threatening situation, they tend to repeat the behavior which they think reduced the threat.

Obviously there is some rationality behind what beginning teachers try to do and find successful. They are not entirely casting about in the dark for an effective way of coping with the situation. Some aspects of their new work can be studied rationally; an example is planning. Most beginning teachers have considerable difficulty with planning, but with minimal or no help many of them learn to organize their work so that they have adequate material prepared for each lesson, they know where they are going from day to day, and they have a feeling of adequacy about the substance of what they are teaching. They do not necessarily learn these habits easily; some never acquire them.

Although the beginner may learn to organize the substance of the daily lessons, considerable work may be done which could have been done before he or she began teaching. The beginner has all he can do to manage the class and get to know the school. Feeling unprepared, not knowing how much to prepare, not being sure of what to prepare creates anxiety which affects performance. The beginner is trapped in a cycle of unreadiness and anxiety, and these feelings lead to poorer instruction and management. He or she feels vulnerable and has a low sense of efficacy. So a downward spiral begins. All for the want of time, direction and support.

Other teaching problems are more complicated because they involve interactions with pupils, such as the management of the class. The beginning teacher is almost invariably baffled by the problems of managing the first class which he or she meets. In this domain of action they are more likely to cast about, almost randomly, for ways of coping with disruptive pupils, inattentiveness, and many other behaviors that are normal behavior for children or young adolescents in classroom situations. If, for some reason, one of these actions works, a problem is ameliorated or averted, and the teacher continues to use the technique. The procedure or action may have worked fortuitously; it may have undesireable effects, but if it "worked," it will be used again and again.

Recent research has shown that organizing and managing are critical skills related to the amount of learning achieved in a particular class. This research has sharpened our understanding and knowledge of what has been widely accepted on the basis of practical experience. An effective teacher is a good manager and organizer of instruction in a variety of settings ranging from a structured situation to maintaining on-task behavior during work periods. Skill in these tasks has to be learned on the job because the training is inadequate, as stated for decades by beginning teachers.

If the beginning teachers do not acquire these minimal skills of effectiveness, the class becomes disordered or disorganized. In extreme cases the teacher may suffer severe emotional consequences and may leave the profession shortly. Those who remain move day-by-day in the middle of chaos.

Teachers who have acquired some control and have developed some organization may not acquire any other skills related to effectiveness. They may lack the ability to use a variety of teaching strategies. Some primary school teachers, we have observed, teach the class as-a-whole. When teachers are asked about this procedure, they invariably say that they can control the class better in this way. But research has demonstrated that this method of organizing a class in fact increases inattentiveness and off-task behavior, thereby reducing the amount of learning achieved by pupils taught in this manner. A teacher therefore who finds that they can control the class to some satisfactory level by teaching the class as-a-whole adopts an ineffective teaching practice that may never be corrected.

Once a teacher has acquired a teaching style, it is not likely that he or she is going to change it easily. This style works for the teacher, it reduces anxiety, it produces some results in the way of learning, and therefore the teacher continues to use it but never branches out into other styles that would make the lessons more interesting or are more appropriate to particular objectives. Few teachers shift to inquiry modes, partly because they are difficult to use unless one is a skillful teacher, partly because they require more effort and work, and partly because one must wait for results in pupils participation in such processes and the development of their ability to learn from them.

We suspect therefore that one of the major consequences of the initial experiences that we have described is a narrowing of focus and a constricting of exploration in methods and techniques of teaching. We think the beginning teachers become less open to development after the initial experience than they were before. Certainly their language conveys this notion. They criticize the lack of practical experience which they had. They point out what they had to learn by themselves. They are in some cases contemptuous of prior training, an attitude which generalizes to everything the college has to offer and to inservice education offered by college faculty members or administrators.

But a number of teachers, their percentage unknown, continue to grow professionally. Whether these are teachers who pass through the transition period in a different way than most teachers is also unknown. It is a reasonable hypothesis that the kind of person who grows over time has characteristics that may have made the mastery of the transition period an easier task, or they may have characteristics which enabled them to extract the maximum benefit from the period of teacher preparation. They may have learned much from the transition into teaching even if it was difficult. Many of these teachers are more than competent; they become excellent or superior.

THE STAGES OF PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

The previous discussions have outlined what now can be presented more formally as stages of professional growth. There are for all teachers at least two stages, and for some teachers a third stage.

The first stage is the kind of growth which occurs during the preparation period. Here the foundation for continued growth may be laid; certainly the faculties of these training programs hope to lay a foundation for progressive growth. In practice, it is doubtful if the college or university provides the kind of program that stimulates individuals to grow professionally over a substantial proportion of their career.

While this may appear to be an unvarnished criticism of colleges of education, it is intended to point to a problem and a potential solution. Perhaps the individuals being selected into the profession are such that they are not highly motivated to learn, to grow professionally, to accept challenges, to tolerate risk, to suspend gratification, and other characteristics associated with the kind of person who is referred to as a "self-starter." Or it may be that the socialization process in the college of education is not as powerful as it is in the colleges of other professions. The atmosphere of continued growth that begins in the college, that is stimulated by the college, and that is rewarded by the college may not even exist in some colleges or departments of education. Some colleges of education seem to be on the defensive, to be apologetic about the training they are offering, and are less demanding on students because they are unsure of what it is they have to offer. In such an atmosphere it is not surprising that the profession is not seen as an integral way of life requiring growth and development over a period of time.

This first stage in professional growth is obviously critical because goals and values are established. In this respect the initial teaching experience in the preparation program is critical because it is the first exposure of the trainee to schools. The shaping of the trainees' values and beliefs and convictions about teaching may be formed almost entirely by this experience. If the trainee is exposed to positive, constructive, creative teachers who have a high sense of professionalism, the trainee will have a model of professionalism which will represent for him or her the goal of professional development. If, on the other hand, the trainee is exposed to teachers who are settled into a routine, who are negative about the school or children, who are essentially unhappy in their work but modestly effective, the trainee may well acquire similar attitudes by assimilation, or assume that such attitudes are part and parcel of being a teacher.

Thus, there seem to be two problems about this first stage of professional development. One pertains to the shaping of the trainees' concept of professionalism, and particularly to the attitudes and values that are stimulated and cultivated with respect to professionalism. The second problem is the kinds of models of effectiveness and professionalism to which the trainee is exposed during the course of the preparation period.

As we have said before, the trainee acquires relatively little skill during this period. We know much less about the kinds of attitudes and values, conceptions of effective teaching and professionalism that are acquired. It seems likely that these attitudes and values and beliefs and convictions are more important than the particular skills that the trainee learns, though certainly the learning of skills cannot be slighted. It seems obvious that what the trainee responds to in the training program itself depends in large part upon his or her attitudes towards teaching and effective teaching.

Thus it is possible to see a lethal combination of limited attitudes towards effective teaching plus a constricted view of what needs to be learned during the preparation period that is reinforced by exposure to weak models of effective teaching. The consequence of such an educational history is a teacher who is not likely to be oriented to the highest levels of professionalism and effectiveness.

The fundamental problem with the first stage of professional development is that for all of these reasons its outcomes are unpredictable. Only one outcome seems to be highly predictable: that the beginning teacher is not prepared for the transition into teaching. Some may be, but most are not prepared, and therefore what occurs during this transition period is even more critical than what has occurred during the preparation period.

The Second Stage of Growth

The transition into teaching is the second and perhaps the most critical stage in the growth of the teacher. We have touched sufficiently on the problems of this period to be brief about the character of this stage. It is a stage through which the teacher must pass to survive in the profession. How the teacher learns to cope with the trauma tends to be used again and again by the teacher. The methods or behaviors the teacher has used to survive become the basis for a teaching style likely to persist over time.

It is obvious then that the attitudes and values with which the teacher enters the beginning of teaching will determine how he or she reacts to the trauma. But the beginning teacher may have a relatively narrow view of what constitutes effective teaching.

There are numerous changes that need to occur during this second stage if the beginning teacher is to successfully master the transition and begin a line of progressive professional development. Some of these changes are changes in teaching performances. The beginning teacher moves from the relatively low level of skill used during the period of student teaching to a level at which the beginning teacher is capable of conducting a lesson efficiently. Other changes are changes in outlook and perspective which in turn have effects on how the teacher acts. These two kinds of changes are not independent but interact.

An example of the first kind of change is the development of skill in putting a lesson together and conducting it successfully for the period of time allotted for that lesson. The collection of skills required for conducting this task successfully have been learned to varying degrees by the beginning teacher during the period of teacher preparation. But probably they have not been used frequently and some of them may not have been used as much as others.

An example of the changes in outlook and perspective that are required are those associated with learning to evaluate pupils. Until this point in his or her life, the beginning teacher has been the recipient of evaluations. Now he or she must learn to make such evaluations and to communicate them to pupils, a task which frequently is not pleasant. Similar changes in perspective about one's self are required to manage and organize a class, particularly to cope with that special group of problems called "discipline" problems.

If the teacher is not successful in changing his or her perspective on what the role of the teacher is with respect to students, the beginning teacher cannot use other kinds of skills effectively. For example, a beginning teacher may have difficulty seeing himself or herself as the director and evaluator of learning, as the manager and organizer of instruction, and as the person responsible for making sure that pupils attempt to learn. The beginning teacher cannot conduct a lesson effectively if he or she is unable to use certain skills of verbal interaction (such as those associated with giving clear directions, of making one's intentions clear, or of giving feedback).

The picture of the beginning teacher at the start of the school year is a picture of an individual who in large part is casting about for ways to teach effectively. The teacher finds some ways or thinks he or she has found a way that he or she uses with some consistency. But as time moves on, and if anxiety lessens and management is established, the teacher must then face the bigger problem of planning instruction and carrying it out in a consistent, efficient, and interesting manner over a relatively long period of time.

We have emphasized mastery of these basic tasks as critical phases in the development of the teacher because they are the foundation of any kind of effective teaching. We have not emphasized or pointed to the necessity of adopting certain skills or of using particular kinds of strategy. Each of these tasks may be accomplished in a variety of ways, but the teacher has to find ways that are effective and that he or she personally can handle. In teachers' language, this adaptation is described as finding a way of teaching that is "comfortable" for the teacher. What is probably meant by this adjective is that the teacher has found a set of teaching procedures which he or she can use well, that does not overtax his or her capacities, and keeps him or her out of trouble while instruction moves along in a reasonably efficient manner.

The problem of this second stage is mastering these basic tasks. Until they are mastered, more complex skills are not likely to be tried. The teacher simply is not ready for any type of performance or strategy which puts even greater demands on him or her than the ones that he or she is using. The teacher also acts like anyone who is suffering a high degree of anxiety -- people in such states tend to constrict their point of view and to limit the number and kinds of behavior in which they engage. Until this anxiety is relieved by successful adaptation to the beginning of teaching, the new teacher can neither see other possibilities, nor, if they are suggested, will he or she accept them as something to be tried. The bases for effectiveness and satisfaction are laid during this transition period.

We have sketched out here the outlines of our thinking about induction into teaching. This first phase of the transition occupies approximately the first three months, if all goes reasonably well, and then continues in an attenuated form for about another three months. This phase is the most critical stage in the professional development of the teacher.

This stage is critical in two ways. It is critical in the sense that if these tasks are not mastered no higher level of professionalism is likely to be achieved. It is also critical because the teacher may remain at the level attained during this stage with very little modification or improvement in teaching style. The teacher learns how to cope with these basic problems during this period, and may continue to use these ways as a kind of survival strategy. In such a case the possibilities for more complex professional growth are limited by the person's unwillingness to give up what has enabled them to survive. Teachers perceive as threats to their survival any proposals to them to adopt more complex forms of teaching, such as individualizing instruction, using the inquiry method, using project work and other techniques and procedures that place considerable demands on their skills.

But there is a third stage which may emerge if this second stage is mastered. This stage sets a solid base for progressive improvement if the teachers' attitudes are not so constricted by the anxiety of the transition period that they are afraid to grow.

We are not underestimating the importance of learning to survive. It is absolutely essential. As this report has suggested at various places, the problem of surviving is all too frequently left to the individual.

One would expect that once the beginning teacher has mastered the basic teaching style which undergirds the educational system, and which for him or her is a way of teaching that is always available, that he or she would be stimulated and encouraged to move to higher levels of training and development. The system encourages moving to higher levels of training by rewarding the acquisition of credits and degrees, but it does not reward acquiring higher levels of competence. Moving to higher levels of teaching skill and understanding of teaching processes is largely done by individuals who are particularly interested in developing themselves as teachers.

There are also relatively few other incentives to change, to adopt more complex ways of teaching. The administrative system may or may not support or stimulate more complex teaching. The major incentive system, the salary increments, simply rewards acquisition of credits which is usually unrelated either to teaching effectiveness or to adopting more complex ways of teaching.

Thus it is not surprising that teachers stabilize their teaching and continue to teach in essentially the same way year after year. What is surprising is that some teachers look for ways of improving dramatically their teaching strategies.

We know practically nothing about how such changes in teachers occur. It may be that the individuals who are most likely to reach a more complex level of development as teachers are individuals whose personal history and characteristics are such that change is consonant with all that they are as individuals. These may be individuals who like problem-solving, are willing to take risks, are more self-confident, and for whom learning more complex teaching methods is a challenge. It may be that such teachers will develop irrespective of the particular kind of teaching environment in which they are working. They may have strong convictions about children learning to think independently, of being able to learn on their own, of having the kind of self-reliance that independent work requires.

Because they have these convictions about the kinds of persons children ought to become, they may be more likely to use teaching methods that stimulate other kinds of growth than acquisition of knowledge or skill. They need only some ideas about the connection between a particular teaching method and a complex form of growth in children.

We do not know whether or not this is the way certain teachers see teaching. We are reasonably certain that there are a number of teachers, numbers and percentages of teaching staff unknown, who on their own move to higher levels of professional activity. These individuals use at least several different approaches to instructing, seem to be more open to new ideas, seem to be more critical of what they are doing, and seem to enjoy thinking about the processes of teaching. They appear to be somewhat more inventive and perhaps even creative in the way in which they teach.

The teacher may become a hypothesis-maker and evaluator, a problem solver, a theoretician, an analyst, and a creator. Teachers may invent new teaching methods. Teachers may conduct studies of the effectiveness of their teaching methods. Teachers may develop and test theories about instruction.

Generally it is this approach to teaching which is believed to be and thought to be the essence of the third stage of professional development. At this stage the teacher has moved beyond simple carrying out of rules or using somewhat uncritically techniques which have been recommended by other teachers or by professors of education. The teacher has acquired enough understanding of the nature of learning and of teaching to be critical of suggestions, to look for omissions of important features of instructional design in a proposed method. The teacher has developed sufficient capacity that he or she may need relatively little formal instruction to use a new method; that is, the teacher has a background of knowledge and understanding about teaching into which new ideas are readily assimilated. We are here sketching the outline of a set of characteristics; the essence of which is critical and independent thinking, analysis, gathering data to test ideas, suspending judgment about the value of a procedure until it has been tested systematically, of looking for interdependencies among aspects of a teaching method, of sophisticated knowledge of educational theory. We are portraying a person for whom teaching is not a low level trade, nor merely a high level craft. It is an activity which is continually improved by critical analysis and study.

It may seem out of place to discuss this third stage of development in a volume on the beginning teacher. But the reality of the education of teachers is that this third stage in some form is held up as the ideal and in practical day-to-day affairs it influences subtly and sometimes quite overtly the evaluation of teachers. Although evaluation systems of teachers leave much to be desired, the individuals who evaluate them may be thinking in terms of the third stage of professional development as the criterion reference for evaluating a teacher. We have seen enough evidence of this kind of behavior to suspect that it may be far more common than is generally believed.

If we listen to the rhetoric of teacher educators and administrators, we hear again and again the characteristics we have been describing held up as what ought to be the norm for every teacher. Such a point of view is obviously unrealistic since the system itself neither selects individuals who are likely to become persons of this kind nor does it provide an educational program which fosters such development. There is therefore a kind of injustice as well as unreality in evaluating teachers on the basis of a model of teaching which the profession itself does little to promote other than through the rhetoric of preaching about it.

The beginning teacher has had this ideal held up to him or her, and some of the conflict about beginning teaching may be exacerbated by this idea of professionalism. We are reasonably certain of two facts: one, that the ideal of the professional teacher is held up during the preservice period as the ideal, and that much of the training in preservice education is designed to prepare individuals for this stage in their development rather than for the next immediate stage in their development. The second fact of which we are reasonably certain is that the ideal comes to be seen as mythological in character, as unreal, as impractical, as unworkable. The beginning teacher quickly recognizes that most of the teachers with whom he associates do not perform in accordance with the ideals of this third stage of development. They have learned to function and many of them are unwilling to examine the bases for their functioning or to risk making great changes in how they do function. The beginning teacher may therefore abandon the concept of the professional teacher, with the consequence that they have no long term stages of growth to move through.

Thus we have two kinds of problems to study when we consider beginning teachers. One of these problems is the problem of how the profession may be lived so that beginning teachers move beyond the transitional phase into a high level of professional activity. The other problem to study is why some individuals can move in these directions and why some do not, even though the conditions for development surround them.

But unless we perceive these possibilities, we know very little about how ultimately to cope with the problems of the beginning teacher in terms of how the system may assist or impede the growth of a teacher. If we assume that the teacher simply has to get through the transition period, and that to do so requires that the teacher acquire certain kinds of skills, then the solution is relatively simple: simplify preservice training so that it focuses on the skills required to master the transition and provide support during the transition period.

If, on the other hand, we see becoming a teacher as a continuum of development, the transition into teaching being one stage in progress along that continuum, then it is important that the transition period be mastered in such a way that it does not interfere with teacher growth. Such evidence as we have suggests that at the present time the transition period does in fact seriously interfere with future growth. Other than researchers thinking and writing about this problem, we do not even know if most individuals regard the transition period as a transition except in the literal sense of moving from one kind of an institution to another.

Inevitably beginning teachers themselves see the transition period as an initiation into a combat type of experience. They know what has happened to them, and they know how they have coped, and they know how they now feel about teaching as a result of these experiences. But few of them have been supported during this period, few have had the opportunity to see the transition as a set of challenges to be mastered in the process of growth. Most of them have been left at the level where they were when they finished the first few months or year of teaching.

The transition period therefore has to be seen as probably the most significant experience in the pattern and development of the teacher. It is possible that some teachers would have ended up where they are no matter what the transition period was like. But it is possible that teachers who might have progressed to a different level of teaching are fixed at the level they reach during the transition period because of the traumatic character of this period becauoe they are so ill prepared for it that learning to survive reinforces using their survival techniques year after year.

This theory might not seem convincing because learning to survive might give a teacher confidence in their ability to survive, and therefore reduce the threat of trying new approaches. They have mastered their anxiety, they can always fall back on what they have learned, so why ought they not to be willing to try new things?

On the other hand for some teachers, apparently the majority, the initial transition into teaching is such a traumatic event, that for some time afterwards, even years, they are unwilling to risk new ways of teaching. Therefore the transition period must be seen as a critical event in life, a major life event for most teachers that determines the direction that they will take as a teacher for years to come.

Chapter 5

IDEAS AND APPROACHES TO SOLVING THE PROBLEMS OF BEGINNING TEACHERS

In the preceding chapters of this report we have described the problems of beginning teachers as they have been reported by these teachers themselves, by experienced teachers looking back on their experiences when they began to teach, and by other observers who have worked with beginning teachers either during their training period or in the first year of their teaching. These problems occur in a series of stages through which beginning teachers seem to pass if they solve problems at each stage successively.

The first stage is problems associated with the management of a class and the beginning of instruction. This phase is followed by phases in which the beginning teacher must solve the problems of planning and preparing in greater depth and scope, must organize instruction over time and must cope with the problems of the pupils' progress. A later stage begins when the teacher is evaluated for the first time, usually after the first month or two of school.

These stages are not sharply divided from each other except that the requirements of instruction and the curriculum usually place the formal evaluation of pupils somewhat later in the first months of teaching than the primary activities of managing and instructing. The beginning teacher's attention is focused from the first day of school through at least the first six months on the basic problems of managing, instructing and evaluating.

But other problems are occurring. Somewhere in this period of time the beginning teacher will be evaluated by his or her school administrator. Each beginning teacher will have to build relations with his and her colleagues on the faculty. Parents will interact with these teachers in a variety of ways, some constructive, some destructive. A beginning teacher must cope with and adjust to life in a new institution, a life which requires greater independence and responsibility on the part of the beginner. Simultaneously the beginning teacher may also be making other life changes, such as living alone for the first time or going through the early months of a marriage, or adjusting to a new community.

Another set of problems arises from the attitudes and beliefs with which the beginning teacher enters a teaching career and how these attitudes and beliefs are affected by the experiences of the early months. If the beginning teacher is overly optimistic or somewhat unrealistic about how pupils will respond to his or her teaching, then the beginning teacher will have to cope with disappointment or frustration. The beginner's self-esteem or sense of efficacy may be strongly affected by difficulties in management. The beginner's attitudes towards organization and planning may affect all of these various problems; some beginners may be highly disorganized in their teaching and in their personal lives as they go through this period of adjustment.

We are not certain how these various problems interact. Does a person whose fear and anxiety arise out of a lack of confidence and ability to manage instruction or out of a general attitude of low self-esteem still have problems in managing and instructing even if they have the relevant skills? Most people will suspect that such would be the case, but we have no concrete and significant evidence to support the idea nor to understand how such general attitudes towards one's self affect one's teaching.

How does the need to adapt to a new institution, to a new stage in life where greater responsibility is required affect the teaching performance of the beginning teacher? Are there differences in the severity of these problems for different beginners, and why? Such questions are the kinds of questions about which we need more precise information.

Our lack of detailed knowledge of the problems of beginning teachers, except for what the folklore of the profession and practical experience has disclosed may make proposing solutions seem unwise. But these problems are pervasive and seeking solutions is critical; it has been necessary to develop and to propose potential solutions that might help the beginning teacher master the transition phase.

These solutions generally arise from the observation that the beginning teacher needs support and guidance during this initial period. Most solutions therefore involve some form of monitoring, emotional support, and instruction on how to teach. But the structure of these solutions differs depending on when they are applied.

These solutions to the problems of beginning teachers take three different forms. One form, the one with which most people are familiar, is to concentrate the preparation of the teacher in the period prior to entrance into teaching, that is before the transition which we have been describing. A second is to conduct the preparation of the teacher simultaneously with the transition. The third is to prepare the teacher prior to the transition and to provide support, guidance and instruction during the transition period.

Of these three forms or structures, the first is by far the most common and the best known. The second does not occur in large numbers and is frequently promoted as an ideal form to which to move in the preparation of teachers. The third form has been tried out most recently in Great Britain and has few if any real equivalents in the United States as far as we have been able to determine. The first form is the traditional program of preservice teacher preparation with which most people are familiar. The second form is the internship which usually follows an undergraduate degree in which no pedagogical training has been taken. The third form is a program in which the beginning teacher is assigned to an experienced teacher who may observe the beginner, but is invariably available for advice and guidance. There are variations on each of these major types that we will describe as we discuss each of the major points.

This report is written almost entirely about the internship and those beginning teacher programs which occur after certification. We will discuss in the following section the traditional program only in terms of its relevance to and effectiveness in preparing beginning teachers for the transition period.

A brief comment on the empirical validity and the practicality of these three alternatives. There are no data to suggest that one form is superior to either of the other two in terms of specific criteria or in terms of producing more effective teachers. We simply do not know which of these three modalities of preparation ought to be adopted on the basis of the results which it produces; or whether some parts of any of these forms are more effective for specific purposes than parts of the other programs. Nor do we know whether one type of program consistently produces certain kinds of effects, whereas the other programs produce other kinds of effects. These sentences merely elaborate the extent and the range of our ignorance about the results of our teacher preparation programs.

We are here concerned primarily about the effects of these different programs on helping beginning teachers to move through the transition period. Even in terms of this criterion, we do not have evidence on which to base a sensible conclusion much less to make an unequivocal recommendation. We are not certain that the problem is to produce data to identify which of these three forms is most likely to help beginning teachers solve their problems. Our view is that we need more detailed and comprehensive study of the nature and characteristics of these problems, their associations with the characteristics of individuals, and a careful study of individuals who have mastered the transition period and gone on to develop their professional expertise.

Knowledge of these kinds is necessary in order to specify more precisely the evaluation problem, which we obviously do not regard as simply a problem of comparing different types of programs. We have, for example, no records of the changes that occur in individuals as they move through these programs so that we have no idea of where the individual who graduates from one of these programs starts at the moment he or she enters teaching. We will return to the evaluation problem at a later point, but we point to and emphasize here that good, hard, empirical data are not available to decide about the utility of any of these three major structures of training, nor are sufficient data available at the present time to sharpen our understanding so that we might establish significant and relevant criteria for evaluating differences in effects among these training structures.

THE SOLUTION OF PREPARING AHEAD OF TIME FOR THE TRANSITION PERIOD: TRADITIONAL PROGRAMS

In all aspects of human affairs it is generally believed that to be forewarned is to be prepared; to be prepared is to be ready. Much is made in common sense of the advantages of being ready for surprises, for crises, or for the steady management of a day's activity. Foresight, planning, seeking advice about what to do in problematic situations are all regarded as estimable virtues and the basis for solid achievement and success.

This wisdom is accepted by many as the foundation for the preservice preparation of teachers. Others reject it. This conflict has been the focus of debate about teacher education, the source of proposals for its reforms, and the rallying points for political strategms to control it.

Although it may seem strange to state the view, it is conceivable that one could begin to teach without having any formal professional training. This view seems strange mainly to those who have advocated the necessity of preservice training and have argued over the years for its improvement. Others have claimed that no training to teach is necessary other than a good education; some have ridiculed the quality of professional training, suggesting that it has little practical knowledge to offer.

We have here two conflicting views, one that substantial preparation for teaching is always a worthwhile matter, and our problem is to find the best form of preparation; the other, that this preparation is largely a waste of time, that what one needs to learn can be learned only by "doing" in the classroom. Much of the argument and debate in and about professional education has been a debate from these two points of view. These issues have not been addressed by empirical studies of the consequences of training compared to those of no training.

It is well known that there are individuals with relatively little training who manage to teach reasonably well or who appear to be minimally competent. One standard explanation for this phenomenon is that we have all observed teachers for many years, and all one needs to use good practices is to imitate the best work of these teachers. Such a view presupposes that the elementary and secondary student who in this scenario eventually becomes the untrained and unprepared teacher has spent his or her early years of education observing teachers with a view to adopting the best practices -- an unlikely set of actions on the part of these future teachers. But the facts, meager and random as they are, are that some individuals apparently learn to teach with very little formal preparation.

Reality is that the view which advocates preservice preparation of teachers has been accepted and institutionalized. This fact is well known and need not be elaborated on here. Every program of preservice preparation rests on the assumption that this preparation is necessary before the teacher can begin to teach. Even if individuals did not believe that such preparation was necessary or worthwhile or effective, they would still have to provide it because states require it. Perhaps because this system has been so set in the structures which administer certification for the profession, it has been extremely difficult to change the form of preservice education. Certainly there has been no serious attempt made to eliminate it altogether. The point of view that no preparation is necessary for teaching simply has no political base of any consequence at the present time and has not had one for decades even though the view has received considerable attention in the press.

But as we have indicated at many points throughout this report and will in the following sections, the traditional program is generally believed to be ineffective in preparing the beginning teacher for the transition period. Admittedly our evidence in this respect is largely the statements of individuals going through or who have gone through the transition period. But the point of view that teachers are not prepared for this beginning period is so consistently reported in surveys of beginning teachers or experienced teachers and appears so frequently in the private conversations or in discussions at teachers' meetings, that the view needs to be taken seriously. We also suspect that more careful empirical surveys would substantiate the assertion that this negative view is prevalent in the teaching profession.*

Some readers may object to drawing conclusions of this kind when we cannot point to a survey of substance which would substantiate our conclusion. These readers may also feel that we are being contradictory when we criticize the methodology of the research but essentially accept some of its conclusions. There are two reasons for drawing a conclusion of the kind which we drew in this paragraph. The research which has been done, despite its methodological deficiencies and limitations is remarkably consistent. The probability that such consistency would arise by chance alone is very small. The second reason is that talk among teachers is almost invariably in the same direction as the conclusions of the formal surveys. Rather significant numbers of individuals would have to reverse their positions, both public and private, if they were to give different information in formal and comprehensive surveys than they have been giving on other occasions.

These two reasons seem to us sufficient to make the kind of generalization which we have made. We expect, as we have said, the results to be in the direction we have indicated. We do not claim nor do we expect all teachers to criticize their preservice preparation. We have observed teachers make public statements in support of their teacher preparation programs; some teachers have been and are enthusiastic and warmly supportive of the quality of their teacher preparation programs. Critics of these programs seem to be much more numerous as well as more vociferous.

We do not claim that the criticism is entirely justified. It may be that there is very little difference in the relative effectiveness of beginning teachers so that one could not detect any effects of the program on the performances of these graduates. But if such were the case, this evidence would be equivocal.

STRUCTURE OF THE CONVENTIONAL PRESERVICE PROGRAM AND PREPARATION FOR THE TRANSITION

Because the conventional teacher preparation program is so well known we will do no more than point to salient features which may affect how well the beginning teacher is prepared for the transition into teaching. What follows is not to be taken therefore as a criticism of the entire program nor of all of its underlying concepts and theories. The conventional program follows a model of professional training like those used in other professions and rests on a reasonably sound view of how teachers might be prepared during the time of their college education.

There are many aspects of the conventional program about which questions might be raised, but they are not germane to the focal problem with which we are concerned. The transition into a school of education is neither as dramatic nor as formal as the transition into medical school or to a school of nursing. The absence of such a ritualized transition and one of generally recognized difficulty may account for many of the effects or lack of effects of a training program on the beginning teacher. They may not be as serious about the profession of teaching; they may not be as serious during the time of preparation; they may be relatively uncommitted so that success in teaching is not critical for them.

But it is important to avoid attributing all subsequent problems of teachers to the unselectivity which prevails in the admission practices of education programs and colleges of education. There may be a connection between this unselectivity and the difficulties which individuals experience in the transition period. If such were the case, however, we ought to find that some individuals are fairly successful at mastering the transition, others have some difficulties, and a third group would have great difficulties. But these do not appear to be the facts, and because such apparently large numbers of beginning teachers have considerable difficulty at the transition period, we cannot attribute these difficulties exclusively or largely to the fact that they are essentially an unselected group of individuals. Obviously we need research on the fundamental problem of the relationship of the personal characteristics of the beginning teachers to how they cope with the transition period. But arguing for such research does not support the implication that the problems arise because of these personal characteristics. That we do not know.

Another feature of the conventional program is the relatively tepid evaluations that are made during the time when the trainees are in the program itself. Few individuals who enter programs are dropped from them and therefore most who enter proceed through to credentialing. After credentialing, approximately half of the graduates of teacher education programs in the past have gone into teaching, a number which has changed substantially in recent years because of the teacher surplus. But the basic fact has not changed that more people enter education for the profession than attempt to practice it, and there is very little difference between the numbers who enter and those who graduate and apply for credentials whether they use them or not.

Again we cannot attribute the problems of beginning teachers to this relative unselectivity except in one respect. It may be that individuals who show serious problems in managing classes, in planning, and in other tasks with which the beginning teacher has particular difficulty are admitted into the profession thereby increasing the number of people who have problems. If here are individuals who during the course of their training period do not manifest particular difficulties in managing classes during student teaching, or in preparing adequate instruction, or in evaluating pupils, is it not surprising that these individuals also report problems in the transition period.

We stress the fact that neither the unselectivity of the admissions or the failure to evaluate teacher trainees rigorously would in itself account for what beginning teachers report about the quality of their experience. Since both greater selectivity and more rigorous evaluation are usually advocated as ways of improving the quality of teachers in the profession, it is important to be clear that these procedures in themselves may not, and in our opinion probably will not, eliminate all teachers who are likely to have difficulties during the transition period. The difficulties of the transition period seem to surmount the differences in the characteristics of the people who are beginning teachers.

In discussing the relation of unselectivity in admissions and anemic evaluations of teacher trainees we are pointing to two characteristics of most conventional programs. As we will see, the internship, the second form of preparation, is usually, and always was as far as we are able to determine, more selective in the admission of candidates and generally, because of the nature of the program, more rigorous in the evaluation of candidates. Therefore if it were true that "better candidates" would have fewer problems, we ought to see the effects of that difference during the internship. But as we shall point out, we do not.

A third characteristic of conventional programs is that they are relatively light on the amount of practical experience provided. Although changes have been made over the past two decades, practical experience in student teaching may be six to eight weeks in length or as much as one semester. The criticisms of student teaching are well known, and most of them were used as reasons for advocating the internship -- lack of full responsibility for instruction and evaluation, lack of involvement in the school, and lack of extended practice. This may be one of the more critical factors affecting the preparation of teachers for the transition period.

The lack of full responsibility reduces the opportunities for experiencing all aspects of management, particularly if the student teaching occurs well after the beginning of school. With the supervising teachers hovering in the background the student teachers are not likely to get into serious difficulty, or if they do, the supervising teachers will rescue them, thus depriving them of the experience of managing a difficult problem.

The content of what they are to teach may be laid out for them by the supervising teacher. They do not take responsibility for evaluation. Their relations with pupils are relatively short-term and therefore likely to be inconsequential. All of these characteristics of student teaching describe an opportunity to practice which gives at best very limited practice in the most essential tasks of teaching. It would not at all be surprising therefore if the majority of individuals graduating from conventional programs had difficulties during the transition period.

As attractive as this argument is it cannot be completely compelling because individuals going through the internship have many of the same difficulties. But we will see that these difficulties are experienced under a different set of conditions, and even though individuals in internship programs may experience these difficulties, they are in a better position to learn how to cope with them.

A fourth characteristic of the conventional program is its typical separation of theory from practice. Although strenuous efforts have been made in recent years to integrate theory and practice, it probably is still true that in most training programs large sections of the theoretical courses are taught well before practical experience and are divorced from it. It has been argued that this separation is a serious defect in the conventional program and is probably one of the factors responsible for the general ineffectiveness of the conventional program as a training system.

As appealing as this argument is, it is not entirely convincing. Again we must face two facts in evaluating such arguments, one, that not everyone who graduates from conventional programs is an ineffective teacher, and two, that ineffective teachers graduate from programs where theory and practice are more closely integrated. As desirable as it may seem to relate theory to practice at the time of practice, or to provide practice as theory is presented, it remains to be demonstrated that this is a critical characteristic in the training of the practitioner.

A fifth characteristic of the conventional program is that it is a gradual induction into practical experience. A trainee frequently begins his or her professional training with general courses in the foundations of education, then does some observing of teaching and study of methodology, and then eventually moves into student teaching. One possible consequence of this arrangement is that the trainees never see the connection between the theoretical parts of their preparation and the practical parts. Or, as is so common in trainees in many professions, their attention is primarily focused on what is to be done, and they have less interest in what appears to be more remote from practice.

Again it is difficult to see how this characteristic of the program would create the problems which beginning teachers have, though there are some possibilities of a connection.

Conclusions

We have listed five major characteristics of conventional programs and related each of these to its possible consequences on how the beginning teacher copes with or masters or fails to master the transition period into teaching. A seemingly plausible but not convincing case can be made that any one of these characteristics in some way accounts for the difficulties experienced by the beginning teacher. As plausible as such reasoning may seem to be, a close examination proves it to be speculative and tenuous.

These traditional programs are similar in structure and scope across a variety of institutions, yet the difficulties and problems of the transition into teaching described by teachers are remarkably uniform. Since there is little variation in the designs of programs and in the pattern of problems experienced, it would be difficult to link a type of problem to the presence or absence of a feature of program design.

Consider the unselectivity in admissions--could it not account for the difficulties of beginning teachers? Not likely, since the entire range of teachers seems to experience the same kinds of problems. Also some teachers, equally variable in their readily recognizable characteristics, such as academic aptitude, seem to have little difficulty in making the transition into teaching. If unselectivity is related to the presence or absence of these problems, it is in a more subtle way.

A more convincing case can be made for the lack of practical experience with the basic tasks of teaching. A lack of direct and real experience with the basic tasks of managing, preparing and organizing instruction, conducting instruction on a daily basis, and in evaluating pupil performance means that teachers in training are less likely to develop all the relevant skills or will develop them only to a modest degree. Whether they have these skills to a sufficient degree to master the beginning of teaching is not known. Each certified teacher has "passed" student teaching, so they presumably have some teaching skill. If they do, is it not enough? Or do they have the skills but need more use of them? The answer probably is that they have a modest level of technical skill, but no real proficiency or mastery.

A compounding factor at the beginning of teaching is the beginners relative and intense sense of insecurity about their competence. To the degree that the beginner feels less competent, he or she is more likely to have difficulties either because they do not use skills which they already have or do not use them well, or become intensely anxious when they find they are lacking certain skills which they must acquire on the job. Careful study is needed to sort out whether it is a lack of developed skill which causes anxiety and insecurity or it is fear of the new and unknown which gives rise to insecurity. It seems likely, however, that limited practical experience means limited skill development and recognition by the beginner of his or her limited skill leads to insecurity and anxiety.

Other characteristics such as the lack of integration between theory and practice do not seem to be powerful determinents of whether or not beginning teachers have problems unique to their transition into teaching.

The conventional wisdom is that these weaknesses in the traditional program account for the problems which the beginner has. This view is shared both by teacher educators and by teachers. But the line of reasoning which we have presented above suggests that it is not likely that, with one exception, the difficulties of beginning teachers can be attributed to all of the characteristics of the programs. The lack of practical experience is, however, a factor which may be a critical deficiency which accounts for the trauma of the beginning teacher.

We can only properly evaluate this hypothesis, however, by looking at what happens to interns as they move into teaching. As we will see, it is difficult to conduct the experimental evaluation which needs to be done to identify the appropriate and highly significant causes of the problems of beginning teachers which could be ameliorated or prevented by training and education.

It may be that such problems are largely a function of the nature of the experience in itself and are inevitable no matter what the training. The anxiety of the beginning days and weeks of teaching may be the anxiety typically provoked by the impending experience of the unknown, by the inevitable fumbling involved in the first time through an experience. But it seems unlikely that this might be the sole or the most important explanation. It is likely, however, that anxiety caused by each of the trainee's experiences is an important factor, and indirectly related to the skill acquired during training.

In brief, the lack of practical experience in conventional training may affect the kind of a problem experienced by a beginning teacher; it probably affects its severity. But other deficiencies in these programs at best affect the occurrence and severity of these problems only indirectly, or complicate them or intensify them. Certainly the weaknesses of these programs will be apparent in their graduates and the weaker the program, the greater the difficulties of its graduates. But the facts even in this respect seem not to be consistent. If lack of practical experience is the probable cause, then its effect should be apparent when the training takes the form of an internship.

As we proceed to a discussion of the teaching internship, these comments on the relation of the training provided in the conventional program to how beginning teachers cope with the transition period will serve as a frame of reference for evaluating the effectiveness of the teaching internship in the same respects. It is difficult to make a literal comparison because the programs are quite different as we shall see, but the same kind of logical reasoning can be used to make judgments about the likely effectiveness of the internship in helping trainees master the transition period.

THE SOLUTION OF EXPERIENCING THE TRANSITION PERIOD WHILE PREPARING TO TEACH: THE INTERNSHIP

The most striking feature of the internship is the radical difference between the kind of practical experience which it provides and the experience provided in the conventional program. Most people assume that the internship, because of this characteristic, is a better means of preparing teachers for all of their teaching problems.

The teaching internship is a major innovation in the training of teachers which has been tried at different points in time in the last 75 years, and had a recent revival through the '60's and early '70's. Such programs are sometimes compared in a less than totally satisfying way to what are euphemistically called "traditional" programs, but the results of such comparisons are inconclusive. Reality is that both kinds of programs exist, some seem to be preferred by some trainees, other types of programs by other trainees; colleges and universities prefer one type rather than another. We have teachers trained in a variety of ways and the range of differences in competence produced by each training institution and program seem to be highly comparable, even when the different programs are conducted in the same institution.

Even the most recent movement to improve the quality of preservice education, the Competency-Based Teacher Education movement, did not produce notably more effective teachers as judged by hard data evaluated against rigorous criteria. This dismal picture of ignorance is hardly a basis for drawing firm conclusions about what characteristics the preparation for teaching ought to have. In this report we are focusing on those forms or aspects of programs which seem most likely to prepare the beginning teacher for the problems which he or she will face in the first months of teaching. This choice is a matter of judgment based upon the observation that the kinds of problems that the beginning teacher faces are primarily associated with the management and conduct of instruction and that therefore programs which emphasize practical training and experience are more likely to prepare the beginning teacher for these problems.

The teaching internship in many of its forms qualifies as a prototype of programs most likely to prepare beginning teachers for confronting these problems. The teaching internship requires the candidate to engage in a considerable amount of practical experience over an extended period of time, and to assume total responsibility for several classes of students. The internship is a means by which the trainee is emersed as much as possible in the life of teaching in school. It differs substantially from student teaching which is usually the culminating experience of most preservice programs.

One of the major ideas supporting the use of the internship is that it provides practical experience of a kind identical to or highly similar to that of the regular teacher. The internship takes two general forms in terms of the amount of teaching experience provided. One type has the intern teaching a full schedule from the beginning of school through the year. For all practical purposes interns in this program are regular teachers and have all the experiences of beginning teachers.

The other type of internship has the intern teaching half of a teaching assignment, but with full responsibility for the classes in this assignment. These interns usually to take academic or professional training at the same time.

There are variations which are combinations of these two major types. In some intern programs, such as the one at Temple University, the internship begins with an intensive summer experience in which the intern teaches only part of a teaching assignment, and during which he or she is given intensive training and extensive supervision and counseling. This initial summer experience is followed in the fall by a fuller teaching schedule, usually a full teaching assignment during which some academic work is taken in evening courses, and then is followed by a second year in which the intern is carrying a full teaching assignment.

The important feature about this program is that the experience at each stage is built around an actual teaching experience in which the intern assumes considerable responsibility, and in most cases total responsibility for the teaching. (During the summertime the intern is not an employee of the school system, and is therefore not responsible in any fully legal sense of the term. They teach under the supervision of the teachers who are responsible for the summer classes.)

The University of Oregon's intern program is a fifth-year program built upon an undergraduate preservice program. Here the concept is that the traditional preservice program provides the earlier stages of induction into teaching, completing these basic experiences with student teaching. This period of preparation is then followed by a year of full-time teaching in an internship in which the interns are carefully supervised and during which they continue to take course work in the area where they are doing their internship with an instructor who is organizing their total experience.

Induction into "Real" Teaching Experience

If we compare three kinds of intern programs, all of them fifth-year programs, namely the Temple program, the Oregon program, and the Stanford program, we could scale each of them along several different dimensions. One dimension is the degree of immersion in practical experience at each stage of the program or the degree to which the intern is progressively inducted into practical experience. The Stanford program is the most gradual form of induction. It begins with a summer experience in which the teaching experience is all simulated in microteaching sessions. This experience is then followed by a half-time teach[illegible] assignment during a full academic year.

The next program on this dimension and closer to using real experience as the essence of the program is the Oregon program, which begins with induction through student teaching, followed by a year of full-time teaching. The Temple program is focused from the beginning around real classroom experiences as the core of the program. During the summer program the intern is given considerable freedom to teach summer classes, but it is not an assignment of complete responsibility.

We know of no program now in existence in which the interns simply begin to teach and are helped as they learn to teach. The internship program at the University of California, Berkeley, in the early '60's was a program of this type. Although reports have been written about it, little factual data are available as to how well this program prepared teachers. One looks for data that apparently is not in existence about crises met and not resolved, about defeatism, about being overburdened; or about the rapidity with which the interns adapted to teaching; the kinds of habits and styles they developed. Such information on any of these programs is lacking, but information about the University of California program would have been particularly interesting because of its unique nature.

Two reasons govern the decision to gradually induct an intern into a program or to move him or her more rapidly into a regular teaching assignment. One reason arises from the conviction on the part of the faculty who design the program that the interns would simply be overwhelmed by the initial teaching experience and would not survive it. The other reason is the practical reason that preparation takes time and the interns need time to acquire some basic skills before they are given a full schedule. A third reason is given in some places, Stanford being the prime example, that it is important in terms of the interns' long-term development to integrate theory and practice during the training period and to extend the interns' academic knowledge and background beyond their undergraduate education.

There is no way to resolve these points of view without detailed and extensive research on the effects of the different arrangements. We, in our study of these three programs, found that the faculty had considerable practical experience with each of their programs. Each program has been in existence for well over 20 years, and the very fact that it survived indicates that it is meeting genuine needs. As we talked to various people including school officials it was obvious that these programs were meeting real needs in school systems for individuals who could be inducted relatively quickly into the profession. We think that the school administrator and some experienced teachers see the internship as a relatively sure and more rapid induction into the teaching profession. The interns themselves are generally positive, and enthusiastically so about learning to teach from the earliest days of their training program.

But we have no real comparisons between interns and other kinds of teachers from which we can say that interns are more competent teachers, that they have fewer problems adapting to teaching or that they are necessarily better trained in all aspects of their need to become fully professional. We will suggest later on that the pressures to evaluate programs competetively has steered us away from the kind of research and development which is fundamental to understanding how to design a more effective program which will prepare beginning teachers not only for their initiation into the profession but for continued professional development.

THE SOLUTION OF PROVIDING TRAINING DURING THE PERIOD OF INITIATION: INDUCTION PROGRAMS

The other type of solution proposed, of which there are very few examples, and about which interest has only recently developed, is the type of program which provides some form of assistance for the beginning teacher during at least the early months of teaching. These programs of necessity have to be conducted by the school system, and have not grown rapidly because they require the release of some experienced personnel to do the supervising.

An alternative arrangement is to work with the local teacher training institution to provide such support but we are unaware of the existence of such programs and we suspect that this idea is not too attractive to school systems. Running through all of these discussions on how to help the beginning teacher are a set of bi-polar attitudes. At one pole is the view that the training institution knows very little about the practical exigencies of teaching, and therefore once the beginning teacher is in the hands of the school system, he or she ought to be advised and counselled by those who know the pragmatics of teaching, namely experienced teachers. At the opposite pole is the view held by university and college faculty that too much exposure to what is occurring in the schools at the present time will "corrupt" the beginning teacher, that is, it will induct them into teaching methods which are antiquarian, authoritarian, unimaginative, and wholly used in the service of achieving the minimal goals of instruction, usually instruction in the basic skills or the basics of any subject matter.

Great Britain has experimented with several different models of a support system, created and functioning in the local school systems and we will discuss these in some detail at a later point in this chapter. In the United States we found no examples of comparable types of programs, but some beginning approximations to them, and much rhetoric about what the systems were doing.

There are some policy issues here, some fiscal issues, and some training issues which affect the development of such programs. It is all too easy to assume that the best source of support and guidance for the beginning teacher is another experienced teacher; but those who have observed such arrangements know that the validity of this claim depends on the experienced teacher the item has for an advisor. There is no magic that will transform the fearful beginner into a confident and assured practitioner. Advice can be given, suggestions can be made, and support can be offered. If this advice and information is relevant to effective teaching, and if the beginning teacher uses it, he or she will profit.

But some of the advice may be poor and at the present time there is no system for establishing the credentials of experienced teachers to help beginning teachers, nor is there any system for evaluating the quality of such help when it is given. Rather there is much rhetoric about how valuable the help of experienced teachers can be, which seems to be largely the product either of the rhetoric of the advocates of the unquestioned wisdom of the classroom teacher, or of the experience of those who have had an unusually helpful and insightful advisor.

We do not wish to seem to be dismissing this idea before we have even described some of its variations. We are simply pointing out the fact that with the exception of the experience in Great Britain, little is known about how effective such arrangements are. There is reason to be suspicious of some of the claims made for the effectiveness of such arrangements.

The essence of such arrangements is that an experienced teacher will work with a beginning teacher. The words, "work with", imply a variety of arrangements, only a few of which have been tried. One form is for the experienced teacher to observe the beginning teacher periodically and to make suggestions on how to improve. Another form is for the beginning teacher to seek out the experienced teacher whenever the former needs or thinks he or she needs help.

A third arrangement is for the school district to conduct regular sessions on teaching with the beginning teachers. A few school systems are trying out this arrangement, most notably in Lincoln, Nebraska and in Houston, Texas. The Houston system is just beginning, and we were unable to observe the Lincoln system but read its rather limited descriptive literature. The Lincoln system provides a cadre of advisors who can work with beginning teachers, but we are unsure as to whether or not these individuals are also available for consultation with experienced teachers. We are woefully ignorant largely because we were unable to go to Lincoln;

being an innovative school district they are inundated with requests for visits and could not accommodate us. We are unable to give the kinds of practical details that many readers would want, but judging from their literature, the beginning teacher could seek the advice of the experienced teachers in this cadre and get specific help from them.

There is another form of beginning teacher program conducted by school districts, and we did visit an example of this type. The Jefferson County District, Colorado provides a program for beginning teachers. This program is primarily an orientation to the curriculum of Jefferson County. Jefferson County has a detailed curriculum which all teachers and the beginning teacher must use.

The beginning teacher program therefore is essentially an induction into this curriculum, and in that respect seems to be a excellent program. But the program as such does not address the kinds of problems we have been describing in this report unless a supervisor takes an interest in the problems of a particular beginning teacher. Some of the beginning teachers we met were having typical beginning teacher's problems in addition to special problems in learning how to use the curriclum. This latter set of problems they could discuss with the various curriculum supervisors, but we suspected that in some cases individuals needed other kinds of assistance.

As the reader may have inferred, the programs conducted by school districts are not many and the programs are always likely to serve the very specific needs of a school system. It is a policy issue as to whether or not school districts should assume the responsibility for providing help during the transition period, and we will discuss this question in the larger context of discussing policy issues. The practical problems, however, are large indeed. One set of these problems is the problem of the quality of help which will be provided. The other problem is the cost of providing such help.

help.

At least one state has tied such a system into the evaluation of and subsequent permanent certification of the beginning teacher. The State of Georgia has a system in which each beginning teacher is evaluated regularly in the course of the first year and may be assigned to a master teacher for additional instruction. There are also other arrangements that may be used to help the beginning teacher such as recommending they take certain course work, the recommendation being made on the basis of the nature and severity of the beginner's problem.

One of the attractive features of the Georgia system is that it is supported by the State, and the system provides a number of functions which most school districts either could not provide or could not provide well. The comprehensive and systematic evaluation of beginning teachers is a feature of this system which makes it particularly attractive as a diagnostic device for identifying the beginning teacher's problems, though most of this diagnosis is directed at specific skill-type problems.

Little is known about how effective this system is because it is too new to draw any conclusions about its value. One can therefore only project possibilities, and when projecting possibilities about these kinds of programs it is obviously better to be cautious. But the Georgia program has some features which recommend themselves as part of any general solution to the problem of helping beginning teachers to adapt, cope and learn during the period of initiation into the profession. One of these is the fiscal support for the system of help. The other is the objective evaluation of the problems of each beginning teacher. It may be that having a variety of kinds of help is a particularly useful feature, but that is unknown at the present time.

It should also be noted that one of these forms of help, the availability of a master teacher, is supported by the state. The state in this case assumes that it is to its benefit to know how competent the beginning teacher is and to put the assessment of this competence in a context in which the teacher can be helped. Thus the initial investment in training the teacher will not be lost if the teacher can be helped, and the teacher will also have the opportunity to acquire skills that they may not have acquired during their preservice training.

Reviewing the above models, we note the following features. They all assume some form of direct assistance for beginning teachers from the staff of a school system. They usually are not linked to the formal evaluation system of the school, but may be linked to the certification of the state. Third, they may provide one of several different forms of assistance. This three-item list of characteristics is neither descriptive of all the possibilities nor is it definitive. It rather suggests what in fact is the case, that the school systems are trying a limited number of different arrangements which are constrained by the resources available or by is perceived to be the problems of beginning teachers.

Little that has been tried is known to be highly effective. Some of it probably is. Some of it certainly is to some individuals. Little is known about the most effective way of helping the beginning teacher. One has the impression that the training of the beginning teacher is essentially a cottage industry. Although we have systems of state certification, the guidelines are so loosely applied that a variety of preservice programs are tried--a state which is usually referred to as one of creativity and diversity, but may be a state of placid uniformity. But a change in this situation requires dramatic efforts on the part of a number of agencies and groups.

Despite our limited knowledge, some ideas seem better than others. Deficiencies are readily recognizable and correctable. As the next step we therefore describe in greater detail each of these two attempts to help the beginning teacher--the internship and the inservice induction program.

Chapter 6

THE INTERNSHIP

This chapter describes the most commonly used forms of the teaching internship--what we know about these programs, their successes and their problems.

This project was originally designed to study the type of internship which follows the completion of an undergraduate major. This type, as became apparent when we began to collect data on existing internship programs, is only one of several types. It is the type which has received the most attention largely due to funding received by several universities in the late 1950's and early 1960's to conduct an internship built upon an undergraduate program. Because the internship has no formal status in the system for educating teachers, it may take whatever form with which a particular institution may choose to experiment.

Some internships are a culminating experience of a four year program, preceded by field experiences and student teaching. Others are a semester of full-time teaching at the end of the student's fourth year.

We should warn the reader that the word "internship" is sometimes used to describe traditional student teaching programs or licensing or credentialling arrangements rather than programs. The State of Georgia, for example, does not give a permanent certificate until the beginning teacher has been evaluated for one or more years. TIME, in its issue of September 29, 1980, refers to the Georgia program as an internship. (The word "internship" is used so loosely that almost any arrangement which requires extended teaching experience prior to final certification is likely to be called an internship by someone.)

One distinguishing characteristic of the internship is the amount of responsibility which the intern assumes for teaching. Some internship developers maintain that if the beginning teacher or the teacher in preparation has complete responsibility for one or more classes, the program qualifies as an internship.

Other developers of internships argue for the importance of other characteristics such as the amount of teaching which the intern does or whether or not the intern is paid for the teaching experience. We will return to these distinctions shortly.

Where the internship occurs in the course of a person's education is also a matter of dispute and in part probably also a matter of convenience. The dispute is about whether the internship ought to be an integral part of a continuing program which extends over several years or a totally independent program which is a complete preservice program. The matters of convenience which affect the availability of an internship and the time at which it will be provided derive from whether or not students can be persuaded to undertake the internship as a fifth year program. Almost all institutions that sponsor a full year of internship have scheduled it as a fifth year which culminates in a Master's Degree. We are not aware of any existing programs in which the internship comprises the fifth year of an undergraduate program, although this idea is occasionally suggested. (This idea was most recently rejected by the Newman Commission in the State of New Jersey, a Commission set up to propose changes in the preparation of teachers. The five-year program was rejected on grounds of convenience, monetary and vocational.)

There is a culture of ideas about how much preparation can be expected of beginning teachers before they begin to teach. Not until approximately 1950 was a four-year program of preparation culminating in an academic degree required for all beginning teachers. Some states now require that a fifth year of work be taken, but the work to meet this requirement may be spread over several years; in some states this work culminates in a Master's Degree. However, as of this writing we have not been ready to ask more of all teachers than the basic four-year preparation program. Neither have we been willing to provide the rewards which most people assume ought to be extended to professionals who take a longer and more intensive preparation program.

These views of what can be expected by way of preparation of teachers are probably the major determinant of how much preparation will be required of teachers. It seems from the literature that most individuals agree that the intensive and supervised teaching experience offered by the internship is highly desirable. But at the present time the internship is not a formal requirement in any state in the Union, although New York State has proposals likely to be implemented in the near future which will require a one-year internship before a teacher is fully licensed to teach in the State of New York.

We were surprised that so relatively few internship programs exist at the present time despite the widespread advocacy of this arrangement and the belief that it is an effective means for preparing teachers. We were not able within the constraints of the methodology of this study to assess all of the reasons which account for this situation, but we were able to learn that many individuals regard the internship as a particularly expensive program. There is also widespread belief that jobs for interns are not available, even though training institutions have not made a serious effort to create internships. There is also a belief, which is critical at the present time because of the teacher surplus, that interns will take jobs away from regular teachers.

There are other difficulties created for internships which are somewhat puzzling. Since the intern is a full-time or half-time teacher with complete responsibility for a class, he or she must be licensed even though he or she may not have received any formal preparation to teach prior to the internship. There are occasionally difficulties in establishing such licensing arrangements, and even in states where an Intern Credential has been created there is periodic opposition to this credential. (Pennsylvania is an example.)

We see therefore a situation in which an idea is strongly advocated, has been tried successfully, but has not been developed or implemented as part of the formal and regular system of preparing teachers. While each of the reasons offered to explain this anomaly are probably valid, the surprising fact is that none of these reasons in itself is compelling, and some, such as the possibility that the internship will take jobs away from regular teachers, are only of recent significance.

The intern programs which we visited have been in existence for over 25 years. They are successful programs, well-established, and have demonstrated the questionable validity of the reasons offered for the lack of development of intern programs. At Temple University, for example, the interns themselves have to seek out jobs, and have little or no trouble finding them, and this situation exists in a city where the teacher's union is very strong.

The dilemma created by this situation is that the essential characteristic of the internship, namely complete responsibility for one or more classes, cannot be met without the intern working in a school as a regular teacher, whether on a full-time or half-time basis. Such teaching opportunities have to be created, and without them internships are not possible. It is difficult not to believe that the introduction of the internship is perceived as such a large change that the vast majority of people and institutions simply are not ready to take on the responsibility for bringing off this major change. Again we return to how valid the arguments against the internship are or how plausible the reasons are which are offered for the lack of internship programs. But before we can discuss these arguments more fully we need to consider whether or not the internship is or ought to be a culminating experience or a complete preservice program.

THE INTERNSHIP AS A PRESERVICE PROGRAM

The internships which were funded by the Ford Foundation in the late 1950's were created on the belief that the profession of teaching needed the well educated liberal arts graduate in its ranks. (Since large numbers of liberal arts graduates were already teachers and at that time over fifty percent of the teachers entering the profession were liberal arts graduates, it is obvious that this argument was largely a matter of rhetoric and was not based on facts. At that time a significant number, but not a majority, of teachers were coming out of colleges of education. This situation has changed over the decades so that the position taken at that time would in fact make more sense today than it did then.) This view led, however, to the creation of the internship as a fifth-year program which was not preceded by any formal preparation in professional education.

This form of the internship was and is really a preservice program condensed into one year where the practical experience is the teaching experience of the internship. In these programs the intern teaches half or more time for at least a full year. The intern is an employee of the school system and is usually paid a salary by the school system.

THE INTERN AS SCHOOL EMPLOYEE

Those who develop these programs are firm believers that the status of being a salaried employee of a school district is an important aspect of the internship concept. They believe that unless the intern is an employee of a school system, the he or she is still seen as a college student whose affiliations and attachments are primarily to the college or university. The school system also can insure that the interns meet their responsibilities because they are employees and can in turn provide interns with some employee benefits.

The view here is psychological and makes considerable sense though, as is usual, there is no empirical evidence to support its validity other than what individuals have been able to observe about interns as these programs have been conducted over the years, and what the interns themselves say. The psychology of being an employee is the psychology of being a teacher and the interns therefore think in obvious and also subtle ways of themselves as teachers. The exact character of this psychological effect is unknown, but we do know that status aspects of entering a profession such as being seen as a "real doctor" or a "real nurse" or a "real teacher" are important to the individuals who are in these roles.

But there are differences among these professions which make the situation all the more confusing. The medical intern has received a medical degree after three years of medical training and considerable practical experience. Medical interns are practicing medicine in a fully responsible way though they are generally supervised. The beginning nurse who is "capped" and receives a uniform is still seen as a student nurse, though the lack of the uniform and the cap is particularly distressing to the beginning nurse until he or she receives it. More than the medical intern, the student nurse is like the intern teacher. Neither has been fully trained, yet each feels more comfortable in their role if they have some of the accoutrements or symbols of their respective professional roles.

It is difficult to estimate the exact significance of these psychological factors and we are not certain that a formal comparative study of internships in which some individuals are employees of a school system and others are not is a study worth doing to substantiate the validity of the claim that the employee status makes a significant difference. Comparative studies of interns and student teachers might well accomplish the same result, and some programs have interns who are unpaid who might serve as an intermediate group.

A more important problem is to try to define in what ways individuals in these three groups are likely to be different. Is the intern more committed to becoming an effective teacher? Does the intern have problems which the student teacher does not because some problems are precluded by the presence and authority of the regular teacher? (Although it seems that such would be the case, there are student teachers who have very great problems managing classes even though they are technically conducting the class under the supervision of an experienced teacher. Moreover, in asking these questions we are assuming that the student teaching experience is as much like a real teaching experience as is possible, and is not like those situations which are seen all too frequently in which the student teacher simply teaches what the experienced teacher lays out for him or her under the eye and the aura of the immediate presence of the teacher whose class is being taught.)

We are, however, not convinced that even questions such as these are the most critical ones. It may well be that the viewpoints of those who have had the experience of being interns or of directing interns can be studied carefully to estimate what the nature of the psychological impact of that role is as well as its significance. This study ought not be done without first deciding that comparisons need to be made in order to justify the claim that the psychological status of the intern is a significant factor in his or her development.

This point of view, however, is not easily dismissed because it is strongly argued by one of our British colleagues that the fifth-year internship is not a true "beginning teacher experience." The basis of the argument is that even though the intern is an employee, he or she is not an employee chosen like other employees, that is, with a view to being a permanent staff member. There is a temporary character to the internship which also has its psychological effect.

This point of view has not been tested empirically, in the strict sense of the term, and therefore we can only speculate as to its validity. Again a careful study of how interns think during the first year and how they evaluate their experiences may shed some light on this question.

Certainly comparisons can be made between beginning teachers and interns in the same school systems and school buildings. It may be somewhat easier to obtain information relevant to this question than would be the case for comparing interns and student teachers.

We see in these questions an important set of ideas which are rather ill-formed and certainly are unsubstantiated. These are ideas about the psychological nature of the role. It is almost universally agreed that the student teaching role does not sufficiently immerse the student teacher in those experiences which help him or her learn what it is like to be a teacher. This point of view also has never been substantiated in any clearcut empirical way, and its validity is largely supported by the fact that so many people believe it. The problem, however, is that cause and effect may be confused in all of these arguments about psychological effects.

The argument goes like this: student teaching is the most common form of preparation for teaching. Individuals who come out of such programs regularly complain they are ill prepared. Therefore the fault lies with the quality of the teaching experience which they had prior to beginning teaching, namely student teaching. If student teaching is at fault, it may be for several different reasons, one of which certainly is that the student teacher has only limited responsibility for teaching and therefore never experiences the "real" problems of teachers.

There is a specious logic here involving reasoning backwards to a cause. There is also an inductive leap from the fact that a teacher trainee does student teaching to the conclusion that that experience does not immerse them in the "real" problems of teaching. We do not wish to dwell on the difficulties in logic, but simply to point out that we are analyzing a point of view which, while one may accept it, has some real difficulties in how it was derived and how it is supported.

Again, at the risk of seeming to be beating a drum, we reiterate that the development of a teacher from the period of student teaching through the early teaching experience is something about which we know very little in any systematic way. We have no theories for characterizing the processes of development in this period of a person's life and preparation for a profession. We have not followed in any systematic way sufficient numbers of beginning teachers through their periods of preparation to be able to trace how they felt at the time of undertaking student teaching, what happened to them there, and why they felt unprepared only months later. Until we have such detailed information, the kinds of questions which we are raising here cannot be answered adequately, nor can the views which are so widely held be challenged, modified or supported.

We do think, however, that the study of the psychological character of the internship and its symbolic significance is an important line of research on the preparation of teachers and their development as professionals. Until research of this kind is pursued, we cannot sufficiently separate out how developmental problems affect the acquisition of teaching effectiveness from how training for the relevant skills and knowledge required in teaching may affect the acquisition of effectiveness.

PREPARATION FOR THE INTERNSHIP

We have been analyzing here the characteristics of one type of internship, the fifth-year internship. We began the section by pointing out that it was a preservice program, and then turned to consideration of one of the important characteristics of this type of program, namely the employee status of its participants. An equally important characteristic is that interns enter these programs with little or no experience in a classroom. The intern programs which have been most successful have all adopted some form of preparation prior to the actual year of internship. Both Stanford and Temple have an intensive summer program, and the University of Oregon builds its fifth-year program on a traditional student teaching-type of program. With the exception of the University of Oregon program, the other programs are preservice programs integrating professional and academic course work into the internship year.

In the minds of many people, probably because of the associations with medical education, the internship is perceived as a year of intensive experience following one or more years of other kinds of preparation for the practice of a profession. With the exception of the program at the University of Oregon, this concept of the internship has only been tried at one or two other institutions. The program at the University of Oregon has been notably successful in establishing and maintaining this kind of an internship. The other kinds of internships are as we have just pointed out essentially preservice programs, and some of their attractiveness to candidates is probably related to the fact that the trainee can obtain all the necessary training plus intensive teaching experience within one year. When such a program is also capped with a Master's Degree, it is particularly attractive.

There is no evidence that any of these arrangements make substantial differences in the teaching effectiveness of the graduates of the programs. Each program seems to graduate a number of reasonably successful and competent practitioners. The faculties in these programs are not only satisfied with them but in most cases enthusiastic about them because of the quality of the experience which the intern obtains. Their graduates are also notably enthusiastic, though we cannot say that we obtained a truly random sample of graduates.

Even though the methodology of this research project did not permit an exhaustive and intensive analysis of all of the results of these programs, the overwhelming impression which one receives from talking to directors of the programs, current interns, graduates of the program and school personnel who have worked with the program is an overall favorable impression of the quality of the program and of its graduates. By any common sense and reasonable criteria it should be said that these programs have demonstrated their utility and by such criteria should be regarded as successful.

Some of them have unique goals, such as attracting different kinds of clientele into the teaching profession, and programs which have such goals are more or less successful in attracting individuals of different kinds. The internship is attractive to older individuals who are changing careers or who are entering a career at a midpoint in life.

But as a form of entering the teaching profession, they are not an incentive to change the general pattern of the types of candidates who enter the teaching profession. The Stanford program, for example, hoped to provide a way for women who had completed the essential tasks of child-rearing to embark on a career at this later point in their lives. It also was to be an opportunity for others who wished to change careers and who could bring particular talents to the teaching profession. Although such individuals did enter the Stanford program, the majority of trainees were recent college graduates. The historic pattern in education until recent years has remained relatively unchanged. Younger people enter teaching, fifty percent or more of whom stay a relatively short period of time; the remainder become the core teaching force in our schools. This pattern continues and the internship has not notably changed it.

This observation ought not to be surprising because the program by which one is trained to enter the profession is only one of the incentives to induce individuals to enter teaching. More powerful incentives are the nature of the tasks of teaching, of the career itself, of the opportunities for advancement, and of the monetary and other benefits which are available in this profession. Some of these aspects of teaching have changed; for example, benefits and salaries have improved, but not at such a rate as to attract an entirely different class of candidates. Claims that the internship is a powerful incentive to induce individuals other than the traditional entrants into the profession simply cannot be substantiated, even though programs of this kind have attracted particular kinds of individuals.

There is, however, some reason to believe that the internship may attract individuals who postpone making a decision about their career choice until very near the end of their undergraduate program. The data on this point are largely personal observations of various individuals who participated in these programs. There is also the possibility that there may be an historic change between the earliest days when such programs became more widely available and today. There is very little information on the history of the types of people who have been entering internship programs over the past twenty years particularly, but the pattern seems still to be that graduates in liberal arts fields for which there are not particularly lucrative careers are still the major applicants for intern-type programs: for example, history, English, and foreign language majors.

THE NATURE OF THE INTERN'S PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE

As we have pointed out the intern begins a school year by assuming responsibility for teaching several classes, usually at least a half-time teaching assignment. Ordinarily the intern will teach in his or her major field in the secondary school. There is no evidence to suggest that interns necessarily receive poor or more difficult teaching assignments. However, they do not have seniority and if teaching assignments in departments are being rotated the intern is unlikely to be given the most choice classes, with the consequence that the intern may have only a limited range of teaching experience by the end of the first year. But since any teacher has only so much experience in the course of one year, the intern is in no different position than he or she might be if they were a beginning teacher coming out of a traditional teacher preparation program. But how diverse can the teaching experience of the intern be during this year of the internship?

Diversity of Teaching Experience

It is difficult to know without empirical evidence whether a particular feature of an intern program is beneficial or has undesirable consequences or some mixture of both. In order to establish an internship the practice has been to "acquire" positions in schools which are subsequently filled by successive interns. If the intern is taking a full teaching assignment, he may assume one of the positions which are available in the school system.

If he is taking a half-time teaching assignment, he may be splitting the assignment of a supervising teacher with another intern. One arrangement is to reduce the teaching load of a regular teacher by four-fifths, making four periods available for two interns; the regular teacher then assumes the role of supervising teacher for the interns. One of the real difficulties in establishing an internship program is reflected in these various arrangements. The internship is not supported independently by the state government or the university, and therefore the positions which are to be made available have to be those which the school system can support.

The practical consequence for the intern is that he or she undertakes the assignments which are available with these positions. In some school systems the intern fills in at the beginning of the school year when teachers for one reason or another are not able to assume their assignments. Obviously we need to look at the historic pattern here before making generalizations about the availability of positions because this availability has changed over several decades. More positions were available when there was a teacher shortage, and interns could simply fill positions for which no regular teacher could be obtained. With the teacher surplus the number of positions is being reduced and therefore positions are no longer automatically available. The school district has to be interested in an internship program and be willing to use its money for this purpose.

The problem we have just been discussing is a policy problem. If we are to have internships as a means of preparing teachers for the teaching profession, then we need to have positions available for them on a regular basis. The internship is hardly an institutionalized form of training when the positions fluctuate with the supply of teachers.

Another problem lies in the nature of the teaching experience which results from making regular positions available. Interns cannot be easily shifted around to a variety of different kinds of classes. They teach, under ordinary circumstances, the classes to which they are assigned at the beginning of the year. They have therefore only that experience during this training period which such classes provide. They also have experience only in those schools which have provided teaching positions.

It is almost universally recommended by professional educators and school personnel that teachers in preparation teach in a variety of schools--that they have an urban and a suburban experience; that they teach in schools with students from minority groups and in schools where the pupils are from the majority group in the community or the society; that they teach in well-equipped and poorly equipped schools. The standards for accreditation, both national and those established by state agencies, typically require that a variety of experiences be provided. But both in the traditional programs and the internship programs these standards are rarely met in the strictest interpretation of their meaning.

The intern who is assigned to a suburban school and teaches the middle group of students in that school does not have any experience with minority students or urban schools. If he or she remains in that school system or moves to one like it, the internship has given him or her the relevant experience; but if he or she moves to another type of school with different types of students, he or she is as ill-prepared as any other teacher who has not had the relevant experience of teaching in these schools.

The internship thus provides an intensive but not necessarily extensive teaching experience. The consequences of this limited experience are predictable. The intern does not develop a range of skills nor does the intern learn how to apply the skills he or she has acquired in a variety of circumstances. This lack of varied opportunities can limit the intern's sense of efficacy or sense of effectiveness. Another possibility is that this intern sees himself or herself as effective in a narrow situation and assumes that the effectiveness is generalizable. In such cases the interns feel good about themselves until such time, if ever, that a situation arises for which they have not been prepared or do not have the relevant experience.

We emphasize the limitations of the diversity of experience in the internship because the internship does not of itself automatically provide a range of experience. It is not a solution to providing better urban teachers unless the internship is organized in such a way that the trainees in it teach in urban schools, as in the program at Temple University.

Intensiveness of the Teaching Experience

The internship experience is as intensive as the interns' instructors help to make it and as the intern makes it for himself or herself. An internship is a genuine, real teaching experience. It is as good as or as poor as the experience in the situation in which the intern finds himself or herself.

But it ought to be recognized that the quality of any teaching experience depends largely on what the teacher is willing and able to try, the kinds of professional goals the teacher sets for himself or herself, the range of teaching strategies which he or she is willing to try, and the critical judgment and creative thoughtfulness which they bring to the processes of teaching.

The intern must first be instructed on the possibilities, must be taught the relevant skills and knowledge for trying a variety of ways of teaching, and must be given the supervision and support required to try different ways of teaching. Therefore internships are not automatically "good" teaching experiences, and because of the structure of the programs special problems arise with respect to quality.

The first of these problems is that the intern is experiencing all of the problems of the beginning teacher. In an internship program where the intern faces a half or full schedule on the first day of school, the intern is in exactly the same position as any beginning teacher as far as instruction is concerned. The intern must manage the class well, must have a definite instructional plan which he or she can bring off, must assume command of the class and must cope with his or her own fears and anxieties about success on this first day. All of the problems of the first day which we described in a previous chapter apply to the intern, as has been reported by those who have observed interns as well as by the interns themselves. If one were to present the reports of interns and the reports of other kinds of beginning teachers about their problems at the beginning of their teaching experience and were to disguise the origins, the reader of these reports could not tell their respective origins. Interns talk like regular teachers about the problems of beginning to teach.

The consequence of this constriction of view, this focus on the critical problems of getting started, the need to deal with one's own anxieties and fears is that the quality of the internship experience may well be determined by how the intern solves these initial problems. We need not repeat what we have said about the logic of this idea, but it seems abundantly clear that the intern will react to this initial experience, and it will have the same influence on him that we have suggested is the case for most beginning teachers. Thus the intern will teach no better for some time than he or she is able to learn to teach within the first weeks and months of teaching experience.

It has been the experience in intern programs that the interns are resistant to suggestions which seem too "theoretical" for them, which means too unrealistic in their perception of their situation and problems. The intern is an open learner but is focused on learning what is needed for immediate entrance into the profession. Whether he or she becomes competent beyond this point depends on how the faculty has organized its instruction around the internship. In some programs the instruction proceeds independently of what is happening in the life of the intern.

When we talked to individuals conducting intern programs we asked if the program were organized around the problems of beginning teachers or whether the problems of beginning teachers were a focus for instruction in the program. Although the answer to this question was usually affirmative, it quickly became apparent that faculties had not in fact focused on the problems of beginning teachers. As we pointed out in an earlier chapter, faculties generally think of the problems of beginning teachers as the problems of all teachers, that is, becoming highly competent and effective, and becoming thoroughly professional. Faculties recognized that particular difficulties occur on the first day and in the first weeks of school, but these are usually regarded as problems in "getting started" which are to be surmounted and then will disappear into the intern's past.

The intern is expected to get about the business of being effective and professional as quickly as possible. All of which are different ways of suggesting how little the analysis of the problems of beginning teachers affects the design of internships or for that matter of any teacher preparation program.

The intern is going through a developmental crisis. Their supervisors and trainers are generally aware that the crisis is being experienced, but the program is structured around a predetermined set of ideas or problems rather than around the immediate experiences of the intern.

Some faculty members may point out that they spend considerable time talking to their students about their problems and providing counsel and support. This claim is certainly true in the programs which we visited in depth and, we suspect, in most other programs. We are not suggesting that faculties are unaware of the problems of interns or are insensitive to them. We are simply stating that the critical problems of interns are usually not the focus of instruction in the program as these problems occur.

If the critical problem of the beginning teachers is management, then the instructional program ought to focus all of its resources on helping the intern solve the management problem. If this were the case, the intern would not be simultaneously taking courses in educational psychology in which the content is not focused on this particular problem. The substance of most methods courses in the first days of an intern's teaching life seems largely irrelevant. Supervision of skills other than management skills ought probably to be postponed. It is this distinction between building a program from the experiences which individuals are having in contrast to providing a program which tries to accommodate to the experience people are having but within a preset structure that we are emphasizing. If our hypothesis is true that how the interns master these early days of teaching determines their receptivity to ideas for professional development and their willingness to try out these ideas, then the colleges and universities have lost an opportunity.

We see, therefore, that during the internship the intern is having an intense experience, the core experience of the beginning teacher, but nothing in the nature of the internship in itself helps the intern solve the problems of this core experience. The internship qua internship is not a device for solving the problems of beginning teachers. It is potentially a way of solving the problems of beginning teachers because it has available to it the training resources of the university, but if these are not used selectively and precisely the internship is no better for solving the problems of beginning teachers than is the traditional program.

Finally, so much has been made about the practical experience which the internship provides that we suspect that it has been overlooked that this experience can lead to undesirable consequences--teachers who do not have the necessary skills for effective teaching; teachers who learn to manage in ways that stifle their own professional growth; teachers who learn habits of teaching and styles of teaching which are less than effective but which they continue to depend upon for years because these habits helped the intern survive the initial teaching experience. We have seen interns reject any suggestions for professional development once they have mastered the critical tasks of beginning teaching. They effectively dropped out of the internship program even though they continued to be enrolled in it; they did as much work as was necessary to obtain the grades which they needed to receive the Master's degree. They also regarded the persons who helped them survive this period as the critical people in their internship experience. Thus one finds that supervising teachers and graduate assistants who carry a major portion of the supervising load are frequently highly valued and the faculty members who design and staff the program are seen as remote and too theoretical.

THE GRADUAL INDUCTION INTO THE EXPERIENCE OF BEGINNING TO TEACH

As we pointed out earlier most of the intern programs quickly learn to provide some form of experience prior to the actual beginning of "real" teaching. The microteaching experience provides an opportunity to learn basic teaching skills to a level that they become easy for the intern to use under most teaching circumstances. The Temple summer experience is a combination of microteaching and actual classroom experience which is so intense that it provides a more or less carefully controlled initial teaching experience. The Temple program seems to have the advantage of a realism that is greater than that which microteaching provides, but because microteaching is also used the program has the advantages of providing carefully controlled training experiences which teach essential skills.

Realism seems to be a critical dimension of any preparatory experience. This necessary characteristic does not argue against simulated experience, but rather suggests that the extent to which the intern is prepared for the first days of the fall depends on the extent to which the prior experience is realistic.

By realistic we mean that the intern is exposed to pupils who are less than totally enthusiastic for what the intern is teaching, who will create real discipline problems which have to be mastered, who in other words are students or pupils like the ones the intern will be teaching in the fall, and who act like pupils and students usually act. The importance of this realism is that it brings to the fore what appears to be one of the most difficult aspects of beginning teaching, that it is not what the interns expected it to be. As puzzling as this observation is, its persistent character cannot be denied. Many (we do not know the percentage) beginning teachers or interns have completely unrealistic views of what pupils are like and unrealistic expectations for their performance.

As far as anyone now knows, the only way to learn to be more realistic and to set more realistic expectations is to work with pupils in an instructional mode. There are approximations through simulations or other kinds of teaching experiences to the full range of realistic experiences that can be provided. Microteaching could be used to help the intern learn how much pupils can learn, but has not been used for this purpose; rather it has been used to teach the interns particular skills. But microteaching could be expanded and organized in such a way that the interns learned first of all how much students could learn and how much they would be willing to learn. Some relaxation of the restraints on pupil behavior could be made so that the pupils would be more inattentive or disorganized or undisciplined as they sometimes are in the course of regular schooling.

The teaching experience in the summertime which is provided in the Temple program seems to offer this feature. These are real summer classes, perhaps more difficult than some of the classes the intern will teach during the year, but having the range of problems of instruction which the intern is likely to meet.

At this point we are obviously speculating and hypothesizing. A hypothesis here is that if the intern has a more "realistic" experience, one factor which seems to disorganize the intern will be eliminated before the actual beginning of school. But we do not know how disorganizing a factor this upsetting of expectations is. We know that it leads to disappointment and frustration which must have their effects on both how the intern prepares and continues to organize instruction and how he or she manages classes. We do not know whether this upsetting of expectations has serious consequences for the beginning teacher or the intern's ability to conduct instruction. Certainly the interns themselves make much of their disappointments and frustrations in these early days, and of how unrealistic they were about their pupils. However we do know that interns have sufficient difficulty adjusting to a level of realistic expectation that their problems in this respect are probably important, even though we do not know exactly how important or in precisely what ways they affect the effectiveness of the intern.

We also do not know how critical this prior training experience is. Interns generally report that it has been extraordinarily useful. The Temple interns were very strong in their statements about the positive benefits they received from the summer school teaching experience. Some of this reporting was remarkable in its insightfulness; for example, one intern who had grown up in the inner city learned in his summer experience for the first time what could be covered in a school program if someone made as much effort in the inner-city schools as they did in the suburban schools. The interns who had grown up in the suburbs similarly reported the development of insights and understandings as a consequence of their experiences in inner-city schools.

But we lack empirical data on the "best" kinds of experiences to provide which will prepare an intern for the beginning of teaching on a regular schedule. At the time when there were a sufficient number of interns in programs, it would have been possible to experiment with various forms of prior summer experience. That opportunity, however, was never used in any formal way, with the result that we are largely dependent on experience accumulated by faculty as they tried various arrangements. At Stanford, for example, a tutoring program was tried but it was a relatively minor aspect of the program. It was never tested to its fullest to determine how useful it might be as a way of teaching interns first-hand, and with a single pupil, how much children could learn, what kinds of learning problems they were likely to have, and what kinds of people they were. Neither was microteaching fully exploited for such purposes. Nor have the colleges and universities fully exploited other teaching experiences which might be provided prior to the beginning of regular teaching.

Intern programs have been sufficiently innovative that it is easy to overlook the fact that the range of program-types offered is actually extremely limited. The summer experiences or prior experiences which are usually offered have been limited to the teaching of available summer school classes, microteaching, and tutoring, and as we noted, even these have been used only in limited ways. Needless to say there has been practically no individualization of prior experience. No program has assessed how well a particuair intern could teach and then organized his or her training experience accordingly. It may be that such ideas while they are priniciple the best way to proceed are too difficult to manage, and therefore are rarely tried.

One summer at Stanford each intern began on the first day of the summer by teaching a regular full class. An analysis of the data on these classes suggested that the interns were quite variable in the skills that they brought to this initial teaching, and from these data one might have been able to estimate the kind of micro-teaching experience which they needed or other experiences which they might find beneficial. In addition, opportunities for observing experienced teachers seem not to have been fully utilized in these prior experiences. The study of individual pupils, so frequently used in the preparation of elementary school teachers in earlier decades, has largely disappeared from training programs and has never been a substantial feature of secondary-school teacher preparation programs.

The intern program is so organized that it is usually only in the summertime preceding the full year of teaching that the intern has the opportunity to observe other teachers, to work individually with pupils, to work with small groups of pupils, to teach in micro-teaching, or to teach portions of a regular class. In principle a diversified training experience could be provided. But the summer school teaching experiences are somewhat limited, the supervisorial teachers are not necessarily working at their best during this time and therefore are not always the best sources of observatonal data. But despite these problems, the summer teaching has been largely confined to a few kinds of experiences.

We suspect that there are two reasons for this state of affairs. One reason is that the emphasis on providing practical teaching experience is so great that other ways of teaching about pupils and learning to teach tend to be neglected or overlooked. The Temple program, which is excellent in what it does during the summertime, is organized from the viewpoint of getting the beginning teacher ready to use certain kinds of teaching skills, to manage classes well and to get to know pupils in the context of teaching them in class. In order to achieve these goals the summer program is full. The intern teaches one or more classes in the morning and observes these classes when possible, but then spends the afternoon in training exercises usually in the form of micro-teaching and other such activities. One gets the feeling in talking to the designers of the program that because of the urgency and commitment to prepare individuals to begin well, that they pack as much as they possibly can into the prior experience. It should be noted, however, that this program is carefully designed to provide two different kinds of experience which are assigned in terms of the interns' major needs for broader experience with pupils.

The Stanford program attempts to run three strands of training through the entire program, and it has always been an essential idea of the Stanford design that the student be working in all three strands. One of these strands is academic preparation, another professional preparation, and the third is practical experience. So the Stanford summer program is a mixture of microteaching, the practical experience, professional education courses in methods and educational psychology, and academic course work. The Stanford program like the Temple program is a full and busy program.

It is important to understand that once the internship year begins so much time is taken by the actual teaching that further preparation of the intern has to occur around this teaching time. In these programs the intern is in school at least half a day and perhaps more, is traveling to and from the school, and is preparing to teach in the school. Course work therefore generally occurs in late afternoons and evenings, as do opportunities to counsel with members of the staff.

The internship has been promoted so strongly because of the amount of practical experience which it provides that attention is rarely given to the limitations of the other kinds of experience which are inevitably forced upon the intern because of lack of adequate time. We have the feeling that internship essentially condenses so much into a year that the nature of what is to be experienced and what is to be taught is determined by very pragmatic and practical constraints. The leisurely pace of the preprofessional program does not exist in an internship. The interns are extraordinarily busy, carry a heavy load of academic and professional work and of teaching. Therefore the summer experience or prior experience is all the more critical, but it, too, tends to be an experience limited to a six or eight-week summer session and to the opportunities which are provided by available summer programs, which are useful but necessarily limited to the purposes of summer schools.

THE SUPERVISION OF THE INTERN

The internship has no magic remedies for providing adequate supervision for the beginning teacher or intern. The arrangements generally are like those in a traditional program except that internship programs have had more fiscal resources over the years and therefore sometimes have provided a greater variety of individuals to work with the interns. The interns are supervised by one or more faculty members or their assistants and by a cooperating teacher in the school. These arrangements are essentially of the same character as the arrangements for supervision in the traditional programs.

The problems of supervision are generally similar to those in the traditional program. The quality of the supervising faculty, their dedication and interest, and their interpersonal skills and knowledge are essential to making a good supervisory program whatever the training program in which it is imbedded. The internship does not attract better supervising teachers in the schools, even though experienced teachers seem to think more highly of the internship than they do of practice or student teaching.

The bitter reality is that perhaps this most critical aspect of training is not improved simply by creating an internship program. This problem is so critical that it has to be studied as an independent institutional problem and treated as such. Inadequate time, lack of skill, low motivation to do the task, few rewards or incentives for performing the task have historically characterized the supervision of beginning teachers. There are instances of institutions where the faculty saw their primary responsibility as working with the teacher in preparation and carried out the supervisory responsibilities in a dedicated manner, but there are equally as many if not more institutions where supervision tends to be perfunctory, where it is a portion of a faculty load, where there are few rewards for performing it well other than those important intrinsic ones of preparing better teachers.

Inadequate supervision in the case of the internship is a critical problem because the intern is conducting regular classes, has few opportunities for formal instruction, and learns what can be learned by the critical evaluation of their practical experience. An intern learns by doing. He or she learns better by doing if he or she has a trusted and valued supervisor who regularly observes him or her, makes suggestions, gives emotional support and is a sounding board for the intern who wishes to discuss his or her problems.

There are two different kinds of supervisory problems. One is the problem of faculty supervision, the other of school supervision. The intern is responsible to the administrator of the school who must provide some form of supervision. Usually this supervision has been arranged for by providing a supervising teacher who works closely with the faculty of the university. This arrangement again depends on how the school faculty are chosen, whether they are trained for supervision, and what their beliefs and standards about effective teaching happen to be.

The problem of supervision by university faculty has two components. The college or university system in which the program is conducted determines how likely it is that faculty will take the work of supervision seriously in the sense that they will devote a considerable portion of their time and energies to it. If the rewards in the faculty are for research and publication or for typical university teaching, supervision is likely to be neglected by them or relegated to junior faculty or to graduate assistants. These latter quite frequently provide excellent supervision, particularly the graduate assistants who may themselves have come immediately from the ranks of teachers or administrators to the ranks of graduate students. But the character of the process of supervision is in some sense being accommodated to another set of values which are irrelevant to it and to the preparation of effective teachers, and in this respect these arrangements are likely to be corrupting of important values relevant to the preparation of beginning teachers.

The other problem with the faculty is their belief system or their attitudes of how they ought to be supervising. We have seen that they are generally regarded as "too theoretical" by the interns themselves. Our view is that they are advocating frequently the best practice, the most innovative practice which the interns are unprepared to try because they are barely managing to preserve order and to move from one day to the next in a sensible way. This image of the faculty is not likely to be resolved.

An idea which has been promoted but rarely practiced is the idea of the clinical professor. The value of this idea is that it would institutionalize the supervisory role, give it status, and put it in a context in which the clinical supervisor has a recognized and important function. This system simply has not been institutionalized except in experimental form in most institutions, with the exception of the University of Oregon which has an unusual arrangement.

The University of Oregon first of all conducts its intern programs in several different sites, at least two of which are some distance from the university, which complicates the matter of conducting a university program of courses. The University of Oregon's solution to this problem is to move the faculty to the site so that the course work is taught at the site by a faculty member who is a clinical professor. This faculty member is responsible for the interns in that area, teaches them the necessary course work, supervises them and evantually evaluates them.

The problem with this arrangement is that the total instruction of the intern depends upon one individual, who teaches a wide range of subject matter as well as provides all of the supervision. The advantage of the arrangement of course is that people with recent school experience take these positions, are themselves progressing professionally, and seem to have been individuals of considerable dedication. But a poor teacher or supervisor in this position becomes a disaster for those interns who are exposed to him or her. But one could also say that the same problem would occur if a group of interns of any size had an incompetent educational psychology teacher or methods teacher.

As should have become apparent in this discussion, the quality of supervision depends upon the individuals who conduct it. But defining the role and segregating responsibilities carefully, training individuals for the role or selecting individuals who have considerable experience in roles like this one, individuals who are models of effective teaching and who can demonstrate effective teaching, who can evaluate perceptively and intelligently determines whether or not adequate and effective supervision will be provided. These problems are common to all training programs in a variety of professions and occupations, are not unique to education and have nothing substantial to do with the nature of the teacher training program with a few minor exceptions.

We think that the internship might upgrade the quality of supervision because of the responsibilities of the internship. The intern is teaching regular classes in the school and his or her failure has serious consequences which the teachers in that school do not want to see occur. The supervising teacher is the means which might prevent disaster or failure which would spill over into other classes or be an embarrassment to the school and its staff. The intern is also a kind of colleague in this arrangement and one is helping therefore a colleague to become a successful teacher.

The other exception which may be a unique feature of the internship is that the internship is also the initial training experience and therefore places a far greater demand on the supervisory process than might be the case in other types of professions or occupations where a longer period of preparation is used or where the preparation is more carefully graded. But how these features affect the needs for supervision or the character of supervision is also unknown because supervision in internships as much as in traditional programs is largely an unstudied phenomena.

DEMANDS OF THE JOB ON THE INTERN

It is very difficult to be trained and at the same time be responsible for doing a job well. The intern has to succeed even if he or she is not trained. The interns do not want to fail for the damage that such failure would do to them professionally and personally; they do not want to fail their students. So they work very hard to teach well but they have limited skill and practically no experience on which to rely. Visualize the first day of teaching in which a teacher must manage a class knowing nothing about the processes of managing and having no skills for doing so. This teacher feels the need for help, but at the same time probably does not want to be too carefully observed until they "get things under control", which may not happen for some time if ever. The supervising teacher wants the intern to begin successfully for all the reasons that success is useful, but is also reluctant to interfere by too much observing and evaluating early on. This situation is indeed unusual because it is fraught with potential indecisiveness which keeps the intern from getting needed help or seems to intrude too soon and thus frightens the intern.

Learning About Pupils and Different Schools

There is universal agreement that teachers in preparation ought to have a variety of experience in different types of schools, different types of educational programs, with different types of pupils. As solemnly and as regularly as this principle is invoked, it is also ignored for what are "practical" reasons. Colleges state that they cannot find the available positions in schools into which trainees can be moved, and among which they can be rotated. But we have found neither in the literature nor in conversation anyone who disclaims or disputes the importance of trainees meeting and teaching a variety of pupils.

An attempt is made to solve this problem through limited training experiences, such as those of observing or being a teacher assistant. Observation schedules can be more varied, and apparently teacher assistants can be moved around because they fill this position on a short-term basis. But we have found no instances in studying the internship where the intern was moved through several different schools. At most in the course of a year of teaching they may teach different levels of pupils, particularly in the high school where there may be a covert form of "tracking" in such subjects as English and history, and where the requirements of the curriculum create de facto differences in the abilities of the class as in mathematics and science.

Moving from one school to another is an even more difficult administrative arrangement to bring off. Usually positions within a school are given to an internship program. The intern accepts a contract and is assigned to a school and within that school to classes in the same way as are other teachers. Unless the school system chooses to move the intern, the intern stays in a school for the entire year, and changes classes in that school in the same way in which other teachers make such changes, for example, at the second semester.

An intern assigned to a suburban school is most unlikely to have experience with the conditions of teaching which prevail in an urban school, particularly in inner-city schools. Similarly an intern who has his or her internship in an urban school does not have experiences which prepare him or her for suburban schools. In talking to interns we found the limitations on their experience to be of concern to them.

Temple University has an interesting arrangement which seems to compensate for the inevitable inflexibility of contractual assignments. The reader will recall that the interns at Temple University begin their program with an intensive teaching experience during the summer preceding their first assignment to a school. There are two sites in which this summer experience is conducted, one in an inner-city school in Camden, New Jersey, and another in a school in Lower Makefield in Bucks County, a suburban area of substantial socioeconomic status. Interns who have grown up and gone to school in the inner-city are assigned to the suburban site; interns who have grown up in suburban areas are assigned to the inner-city site. The interns commented on how valuable this experience was for them.

One intern from the inner-city stated unequivocally and firmly that he would have had no idea of what was offered to students in an educational program if he had not had this experience in a suburban site, albeit a summer school experience. He pointed out that in the school where he participated during the summer he found that at least a third more content was covered and expectations for student performance were correspondingly higher. He returned to teaching in the inner-city in the fall (we were talking to him in his second year of internship) determined to organize the curriculum and the coverage of content in much the same way as he had observed in the suburban school.

In a different but related way, interns from suburban sites experience, frequently traumatically, what it is like to be in an inner-city school. These interns when they find positions in Philadelphia feel better prepared for the experiences which they were having there.

We have no way of knowing whether the Temple University's arrangement is a better arrangement than having interns teach in two different places during the period of the internship. We think, however, that it might well be because the summer experience is a carefully supervised experience. The interns are in the school all day with faculty members from the University who advise them and observe them continuously. The interns also have simulated experiences in the form of microteaching in which they can practice the relevent skills. They also have the opportunity to observe and to talk with experienced teachers as well as teaching their classes.

This combination of varied and controlled learning experiences, comprehensive supervision and advisory support, with opportunities to observe and discuss, as well as to teach in a limited form creates an opportunity to learn without the trauma of being fully responsible for teaching a class. In contrast the intern who finds himself or herself in an inner-city school and in an inner-city for the first time in his or her life may well be traumatized by the experience and is certainly going to feel unprepared for teaching in a school that is so unlike the school in which he or she was educated.

Temple University has in its arrangement solved in one way the problem of broadening the range of teaching experience in different types of schools. Such an arrangement appears to be beneficial and to achieve the purposes which are usually stated for varying the teaching experience of student teachers and interns. How "good" this system is or whether there are alternatives which are even more useful or effective, we do not know because we have not found other arrangements and there are no empirical studies on this matter.

We should note, however, that the Temple arrangement is one of the few arrangements which seems to have been made to provide varied experience. Internships simply do not provide varied experiences and the reason is almost invariably the same: the intern is assigned a school, accepts a teaching position, and does not move around in that teaching position any more than any other teacher does. The internship therefore cannot be counted as providing a broader experience than other forms of preparing teachers, although a particular intern program may provide arrangements which diversify the experience of the intern.

Although the practical administrative problems seem to be the source of the reasons why the internship is a limited experience, there may be two other reasons which perhaps subtly have led people to accept this state of affairs in the internship. The internship in most programs, if not all, rests on the premise that the internship is an extended in-depth teaching experience as much like the "real" teaching experience as is possible. As we have noted, there is every reason to believe that the internship provides that kind of an experience, and differs from real teaching only in that the teaching may be part-time or that the intern is only temporarily, that is for one year, officially assigned to that school. (As we have noted, we do not think that this second difference is that critical though others hold different views.)

What is important for the analysis being presented here is the obvious conviction on the significance of this kind of a teaching experience as a superior way of preparing teachers. Those who advocate, design and work in intern programs are uniformly convinced of the value of the teaching experience. There is no reason to question their conviction, though it should be pointed out that the evidence that it is a superior way of preparing teachers is not based on hard data.

It may be that this conviction acts to attenuate the second conviction that the intern ought to have a variety of experience. Real teaching means being assigned to a school for no less than one year and in the case of the elementary teacher to the same group of pupils for that year; the high school teacher may or may not have the same group of pupils for a year and for the same subjects. Stability over the course of the year, immersion in the life of one school, working with the same strata of pupils are all features of ordinary teaching and give distinctive tone and character to the life of the teacher. One hears teachers describing the differences between freshman and seniors in high school and the consequences for working with them. Similarly elementary teachers describe the differences between children in the primary grades than those in the intermediate grades. It is part of the experience of being a teacher to work for the term of at least a year with children in one of these stratas. Since the life of teaching is of this character, it may be that the designers and developers of programs feel that having this continuous experience is more important than having a varied experience.

We were not able in our discussions with various individuals to sort out differences in views on these two points nor were we able to test the hypothesis presented in the preceding paragraph. We are offering it as a hypothetical explanation to be tested. The facts are contradictory. Almost all program developers and designers and participants support strongly the value of diverse experience for the sake of the record, but the conviction seems to weaken in the course of discussing the practical problems of implementing this conviction. In that kind of a conversation one hears, not a denigration of varied experience, but a lessening of its ultimate importance, a suggestion that continuous experience may be the most important kind of experience.

Frankly we are not certain now how one would probe to find out if a hypothetical explanation is a factor in the relatively weak efforts which have been made to provide varied experience. We are reasonably certain that such a statement will be challenged, but the facts seem to support it. It is not sufficient to look at an internship program and to point to the fact that some interns are in inner-cities and some are in and character to the life of the teacher. One hears teachers describing the differences between freshman and seniors in high school and the consequences for working with them. Similarly elementary teachers describe the differences between children in the primary grades than those in the intermediate grades. It is part of the experience of being a teacher to work for the term of at least a year with children in one of these stratas. differences, nor a seeking out of knowledge that might be useful in one's own situation or in some future situation, but rather a subtle form of status seeking usually couched in sentences that begin with the words "But that does not happen in my school", or "In our school we....". The experience is not shared in the sense that it is an experience that both conversationalists have had mutually.

A view prevailed for decades that the tasks of teaching were common across a variety of teaching situations. It may be that this view also functioned to attenuate the importance of having varied experiences. Teacher educators thought in terms of the concept of generic teaching skills which could be learned in any teaching situation and could be transferred from one teaching situation to another. This concept has been greatly weakened by recent research on teaching which has demonstrated that effectiveness in teaching one subject is not always accompanied by effectiveness in teaching another subject and that in fact the teachers who are most effective in the teaching of one subject use different skills than those who are effective in the teaching of another subject (McDonald and Elias, 1976).

But the old belief lingers on, partly because people are not familiar with the more recent research, partly because they do not believe it, partly because accepting it and using it would require rather substantial changes in teacher education programs. To the degree that one believes that teaching is a homogeneous task and to the degree that one believes that as long as instruction is varied in terms of the major aptitudes of pupils, one is unlikely to see the importance of teaching in circumstances where factors other than aptitude or ability affect the character of teaching.

The social changes of the last two decades, however, have pushed into the forefront of our consciousness the importance of cultural, ethnic and racial differences as they relate to the character of instruction in the schools. Considerable effort has been made to acquaint and familiarize teachers and teacher educators with the character of such differences and their significance for how pupils from different backgrounds and environments are instructed. Despite this great emphasis, however, on the importance of such differences, the implications for teaching and for the education of teachers have not been universally accepted.

Even though, for example, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education has recently adopted a standard that requires that every teacher education program have a multi-cultural component, and even though the acceptance of this standard was voted on by those who are accredited by NCATE, discussions of the standard, how it will be used, how institutions will be evaluated by that standard, and private discussions clearly reveal that the standard while accepted as a broad principle is not accepted wholeheartedly and totally as a necessary element in the preparation of teachers. We are not implying that the basis of this difference of opinion is ethnic or racial prejudice; we do not intend to suggest that in any way. There are real differences of opinion on how multi-cultural differences may affect instruction, and the degree to which all teachers in all professional schools of education must be prepared to cope with these differences in their teaching.

This range of opinions on this subject do have their origin in a concept of generic teaching capability and also in a concept that, although instruction should be modified on some dimensions for students who are different in background and origin from the white, middle-class student, instructional variation or curricular variation should not be correspondingly great because the non-white, non-middle-class student ought to receive the same kind of educational experiences as the white, middle-class student.

INFLUENCE OF COMMON ATTITUDES ON THE DESIGN OF INTERN PROGRAMS

We have spent several pages discussing this particular point because it illustrates a characteristic of teacher education which is not sufficiently attended to when discussing different kinds of teacher education programs. Running through the corpus of teacher education is the blood of attitudes and values. These attitudes and values are common; in some sense they define the professional field of teacher education; they are widely shared; and in some instances may be even necessary for recognized membership as a teacher educator. These attitudes and values have prevailed in teacher education for many decades and they are the foundation of the basic points of view which ultimately determine what is done by way of developing a particular kind of teacher education program.

Thus it is possible for many teacher educators to support the notion of an internship but at the same time make that internship much like the student teaching experience, and perhaps so much so that the only difference is the degree to which the intern has full responsibility for the class which he or she is teaching and the amount and duration of the teaching experience itself. We think there are advocates of the internship who believe that these two differences in themselves are sufficient to make for a qualitatively different teaching experience. We are suggesting here that these two characteristics do make for a qualitatively different teaching experience, but in some cases for undesirable reasons. We are also pointing out that the internship does not solve other problems which have plagued teacher educators or concerned them because the solution to these other problems require more than structural solutions; they require changes in attitudes and points of view.

Providing varied experience for the teacher trainee is a case in point. As we have noted, this idea is accepted as an article of faith by practically every teacher educator if one merely asks, "Should teacher trainees have varied experience?"*

The principle is rarely implemented in practice, and therefore we must question why it is not. Practical reasons provide a handy explanation, but we are also concerned about the kinds of attitudes and values which prevail in the profession of teacher education and which therefore determine what ultimately gets done in any kind of teacher education program. This relationship has not been studied at all in any way at any time as far as we can determine.

---

*Obviously this statement is a strong statement in the absence of systematic survey data. But we have found in reading the literature no exception taken to the value of varied experience. We found among individual program developers who could not provide varied experience as rich as they would have liked, an apologetic attitude as if they had somehow betrayed or undermined this principle, or a sliding around the issue. We suspect that persistent and systematic data-gathering across a wide sample of teacher educators would reveal what we are here claiming.

There are two aspects of teacher education which are noteworthy in this respect. First, the developers of new programs always claim to achieve goals which their predecessors did not achieve in other programs. Second, the criterion for deciding whether a new program is worthwhile is whether or not it produces more effective teachers than its predecessors. Since this latter kind of study is rarely done, and if it is, never appears in the literature, the value of a particular program-type is supported by the original logic and rationale. Since this rationale is usually hortatory and rhetorical, a circular argument is created which then leads to the belief that facts exist which have never been discovered.

Thus it is claimed that the internship is a rich teaching experience because it is different; since the facts of the difference are never questioned or substantiated, it in time is assumed that interns are having a rich and varied experience. Because it is assumed that they are having a rich and varied experience, the internship is touted and promoted on the basis of providing a rich and varied experience.

We are suggesting a way of looking at the problem. It may be that real differences do not occur in these programs at the level of functional experience, except in a few limited ways, because the prevailing attitudes of people designing these programs are like the prevailing attitudes of those who designed the old programs. Despite the aura and the fact of creativity and originality which characterized internship programs in the '60's, obviously their developers could move away only so far from what their predecessors had been doing, or their programs would never have been established in schools of education or would have been quickly discontinued, as apparently some of them were because they were too "different".

To properly evaluate an internship program therefore with a view to comparing it with other kinds of programs, we need to ask among other questions, the extent to which the view of teacher educators is significantly different from that held by their predecessors. If it is not, essentially the same kinds of activities will go on in the internship but in a different form. We are questioning whether the provision of varied experience which historically has been given a lower priority than providing other aspects of the experience does not represent the consequences of the prevailing beliefs and attitudes about the character of experience that an intern ought to have. It may be that there is widespread reluctance to put any kind of a teacher trainee into inner-city schools because of the real difficulties in teaching in these schools.

As this practice prevails it tends to be the data to support a self-fulfilling prophecy. This attitude also works in reverse in a kind of corkscrew manner. It is so important to get competent teachers into the city, that other teacher educators de-emphasize the importance of experience in teaching children living in suburban communities.

THE INTERNSHIP AND THE PROBLEMS OF BEGINNING TEACHING

One has the impression that the training of the beginning teacher is essentially a cottage industry. Although we have systems of state certification, the guidelines are so loosely applied that a variety of preservice programs are tried, a state which is usually referred to as one of creativity and diversity, but may be as much a state of confusion and lack of direction. But it is pointless to be critical of this situation because to change it requires some dramatic efforts on the part of a number of agencies and groups. The purpose of this report, rather, is to point to the significance of the problems of beginning teachers, the inadequacies of the solutions so far used, the characteristics of solutions which may be effective, and to suggest ways to proceed pragmatically to develop more knowledge and understanding about the problems of beginning teachers and how to help them.

The first and most important demand placed on the intern is of managing the class, which as we have been discussing, is a demand that creates great anxiety for the intern. If in addition the intern is learning the skills of management for the first time, and if his or her supervising teacher is reluctant to intrude too soon in the year, it is not unlikely that many interns will get into real difficulties in managing their classes. These problems may be very great so that classes are out of control. Or they may be of sufficient magnitude that the real work of instruction is systematically undermined.

Such problems are like a progressive disease, they only become worse, even though there may be temporary periods in which the problem is ameliorated. The intern needs concrete and practical help, needs it immediately, needs regular supervision to insure that he or she is coping adequately with the confronting problems of managing a class.

We do not wish to exaggerate the complexities and difficulties of this situation, but in no other aspect of occupational life do we permit, in fact encourage, an individual to take command and responsibility with so little prior training or without demonstration of minimal competence to handle the responsibility, or without close supervision. Some analyses we might draw would sound ludicrous, such as permitting someone to fly an airplane, or a potential physician to operate, or a nurse to manage complex health-care procedures.

Regrettably, as we pointed out earlier, we do not have information on the effects of those programs which emersed interns in teaching without prior practical experience and with a limited amount of ongoing supervision. Such programs did not report large numbers of failures to adjust to teaching, nor have there been any kinds of rumors which might supply the data when it has not been formally presented by the developers of the program. But although it seems inconceivable that a person could learn to teach with no prior instruction, it does happen. Our ignorance is not about the fact of such occurrences, but about the conditions which describe them and explain them.

For decades, for example, graduates of liberal arts colleges who for a long period of time were the major source of supply of teachers, had a minimal amount of practical experience in teaching before they began to teach. These schools prided themselves, and so still do, on giving little formal work in professional education. Their graduates have been as successful as graduates of other institutions as far as anyone can determine, there being no solid empirical evidence to the contrary available.

The point of view that no preparation for teaching is necessary is well known and need not be repeated here. There is no empirical evidence to support that argument or its contrary (though one study in a simulated situation is usually cited as evidence that preparation for teaching is not necessary). The issue here is whether or not the beginner can survive or master or cope with the first experiences of teaching without extensive preparation, or under what conditions they can, or what characteristics they must have to do so. Such studies, however, are useful only to the degree that they separate out what can be learned by observing teachers or through other kinds of experiences, from what must be learned by direct experience or from direct instruction.

It is all too easy to use instances of this kind to argue against the professional preparation of teachers. But the problem which has been unresolved by conducting careful empirical studies is to determine the various ways in which learning to teach may be accomplished. Obviously the problems of beginning teachers are prime evidence that this analysis is badly needed. These problems of beginning teachers seem to exist whenever a teacher meets a class for the first time, having full responsibility for conducting that class. If some individuals are able to manage this situation without considerable formal preparation, then we ought to know what they bring to the situation which makes this success possible. In contrast, we also ought to be able to find out and should find out why others are having such great difficulty in moving through the transition into teaching.

Managing the flow of time

The other major problem of beginning teachers is managing the flow of time and coping with the variety of tasks and demands which the job of teaching inevitably imposes on its holders. This management of time has several different dimensions. One of these dimensions is the dimension of organizing the flow of the curriculum from day to day. Another is relating such major tasks as evaluating pupil performance and achievement to the flow of the curriculum and to the design of the instructional system which the teacher is using.

Still other aspects of managing the flow of time relate to how the personal life of the teacher, as a new member in the school leading a relatively isolated life, relates to the rest of the faculty in the school, and how these relations affect the teacher's management of instruction.

We need not here repeat all the problems of beginning teachers. We are organizing them under a different category in this section. Here we are calling attention to the fact that the job of teaching has demands which the intern must meet, even when they are not teaching full-time.

Emotional involvement in the work of teaching and the life of the school

The intern may be leading two lives, the life of a teacher, and the life of a graduate student. Such appears to be the case, but in reality most interns seem to develop the orientations and to have the feelings of a teacher. Their life is essentially controlled by the demands of the teaching position and they act and react to these demands accordingly.

In reality interns live only one life, the life of a teacher, which has added to it some features of the life of a student. They are therefore emotionally involved in the work of teaching and to a great extent in the life of their school. These are new emotions, for which we have very inadequate descriptions in the research literature. We know very little, for example, how interns feel about the kinds of responsibilities which they now accept, but they see themselves as teachers and express these feelings of responsibilities in talking about their teaching.

They also have the emotional reactions of teachers to the involvement of success or failure of their students. If students do not learn, they feel personally responsible and react emotionally in response to this state.

It is not too strong a statement to say that the intern is experiencing an entirely different emotional life than he or she has experienced to this point. This emotional life is the focus of their work and because of its highly interpersonal nature it is probably far more intense than the emotional life associated with many other kinds of work or kinds of jobs.

Again the significance of this factor is that this situation is thrust upon the interns, as it were, at the very time that they are attempting to learn to cope with the position. There is no way that they can be emotionally detached from their teaching experience nor can they treat it simply as a training experience which has its ups and downs, and in which they are likely to make some mistakes but from the consequences of which they are protected by being in an artificial situation or one in which someone else will make sure that these consequences are not too serious.

What we have been saying is that the intern is so emersed in the job by the very nature of the internship that in fact they experience the totality of the life of that job at the very time that they are almost completely unequipped to cope with the job. Even a summer's experience preceding the internship may not prepare, and in some cases obviously does not, the intern for the complete range of demands which are placed upon him or her at the beginning of the school year.

To the degree that an internship does create the conditions of real teaching, it thereby makes the induction into the internship a complicated, complex and challenging matter. It places demands on an intern which he or she has not experienced, and with which they have to cope while carrying the full responsibilities of teaching. We point to these aspects of the position of internships because they are the other side of what is usually stressed as the main attraction of the internship, that it is as much like real teaching as it is possible to be without being a full-time teacher employed by the school district on a continuing basis. The more classes the intern teaches, the more like full-time teaching the internship becomes so that in some types of internships that have been tried the only difference between the internships and regular teaching is that the hiring of the intern carries no commitment beyond the year of internship teaching. There are those who argue that this difference makes the internship sufficiently unlike regular teaching so that the problems of interns ought not to be treated as the problems of beginning teachers. But it is very difficult for us to see that this difference in a possible future changes the psychological nature of the experience which the intern appears to be having, which as far as anyone can detect in ordinary observations is the same kind of experience that the beginning teacher is having.

THE QUALITY OF THE INTERNSHIP EXPERIENCE

The quality of the internship experience depends upon three conditions: 1) the kind of school and the characteristics of the pupils in that school to which the intern is assigned; 2) the quality of supervision by the teachers and administrators in that school; 3) the degree to which the faculty of the training institution relate their instruction to the practicalities of the intern's life. Of these three conditions, the second is probably the most important because on it depends the intern's ability to cope with the day-to-day problems, and hence is directly related to his or her survival. It is also most likely to influence the course of the intern's future development.

We have stressed this point before, and therefore repeat it only briefly. If the quality of the supervision is such that it encourages the intern to teach like the teachers in the school, and if that teaching is pedestrian, uninspired, conventional, the intern is likely to adopt this teaching style and in this way limit his or her potential for future development. The intern will have no models of the best professional practice, will have no stimulation to seek out such models, will in fact be told that "going along" is a way of "getting ahead" or surviving.

The critical role of the supervising faculty in the school has not been adequately recognized. It tends to be a thorn in the side of the college faculty except in those institutions which have worked very hard to build a supervising staff in the schools and to train them and to work with them.

It seems to us that the important issue is the degree to which the faculty accords status to the supervising teacher position which in turn may mean giving them more responsibility than they now have. For example, since the intern is the student of a college or university, the college or university is primarily responsible for the evaluation of the intern. Although some faculties work very closely with supervising teachers, this supervising teacher does not have the final responsibility for evaluating the intern.

Whether we would have better supervision if the school faculty had more responsibility for evaluating, we cannot say, and as the reader is probably expecting us to say, there is practically no real empirical evidence on this point. Most of the discussion in the literature pertains to raising the status of the supervising teacher largely with a view to "capturing" the teacher and thereby involving him or her more deeply in the work of the internship.

Realistically practicing teachers contribute this service: the monetary and professional rewards for it are miniscule. With the exception of one institution, Stanford University, the rates at which supervising teachers are paid has apparently changed very little in the last two decades, and they were never very generous. Attempts have been made to change the supervisory position to a quasi-faculty position or adjunct position. The notion of a "clinical professor" has been advocated for a long time but does not seem to have had any real try-out, nor has any extended effort been made to institutionalize the position.

What seems to be a highly effective form of supervision exists almost everywhere where there are internships, is praised but is not treated as the critical ingredient of programs which it appears to be. This is the system of using advanced graduate students as supervisors. These supervisors have the advantage of being fairly recently in positions of teachers or supervisors in the schools. They are likely to develop a great interest in the interns and in fact in emotional identification with them. They therefore are likely to be very helpful to the intern.

This role has been institutionalized in one university at the level of the lowest ranks of the faculty, namely instructor. But even this institutionalization obviously treats the position of supervisor as a temporary position. We point to the advantages of the use of supervisors of this kind which are very real. They are: 1) the faculty has complete control over the selection of these individuals; 2) they can be trained more extensively than teachers in the school; 3) if they were in fact recently in the schools, their experience is as current as that of the practicing teachers in the school; 4) they are relatively and even maybe totally detached from the politics of the school in which the intern is teaching; 5) they are not burdened with a full teaching schedule; 6) they themselves are thinking about the problems of curriculum and instruction because of the graduate work in which they are involved.

It seems to us that rather than proposals which recommend taking making school faculty into clinical professors, that an arrangement might be worked out in which graduate students or instructors might conduct classes in the schools and become part-time teaching faculty (again assuming that positions of this kind do not take jobs away from teachers). In such an arrangement an intern could work in the class of his supervising graduate teacher, teach in that class under the direction of this individual, watch demonstrations by him or her, and thus enrich the intern's training experiences in the school.

The problem with this relation between the supervising teacher and the intern is that it has always been a difficult one to work out satisfactorily. The reasons for that condition are partially related to the incentives that are offered to the supervising teacher, partly to the position which the supervising teacher must maintain in the school as a teacher, and partly to the fact that many of the individuals who might be considered for the position of supervising teacher are not intellectually interested in the problems of instruction, nor do some of them have any depth of knowledge of curriculum and instruction.

As long as this situation prevails, it will be very difficult to provide the interns with the kind of close relationship with a working teacher which is envisioned by everyone, but which is rarely realized in practice. If such a relationship cannot be built for the intern on a systematic institutionalized basis, the quality of the internship experience degenerates considerably.

When the intern does not have a "good" supervising teacher, he or she has to learn on their own, gets inadequate feedback on performance, lacks a source of support, or is socialized into the existing system of that school which may ultimately limit the intern's professional development. The third condition upon which the quality of the intership experience depends is the quality of the faculty supervision provided for the intern in terms of its practicality. Although this is an important condition, it turns out in practice that if the faculty is unrealistic in their recommendations during supervision, that by and large the intern can ignore them. There may be a period of temporary conflict, or the faculty member may create, in what appears to be relatively rare instances, a situation in which the intern feels pressured to teach in a way that he or she finds uncomfortable simply to avoid a negative evaluation.

The more unrealistic or remote or too far ahead of where the intern is that the faculty member is, the less influence the faculty member has on the intern, and the more the intern is projected into a situation of potential conflict. But there is no simple way to insure that faculty deal with the practicalities of the teaching situation because of the many difficulties associated with supervision being conducted by faculty members, particularly senior faculty members. The problems here have been described numerous times. They derive from the nature of the reward system in the college or university in large part. Where the college rewards active supervision, one usually finds that even senior faculty engage in considerable supervision.

They are also influenced by the regency of the faculty's experience, and their own successes as teachers. The faculty member who has been out of the schools for five, ten, or more years may simply not understand the demands of teaching at the time when the intern is being trained. There have been suggestions for remedying this problem, such as requiring faculty members to teach periodically in schools, but this recommendation does not seem too practical, and certainly it has been difficult to implement. In general recommendations of the kind that require significant changes in institutional arrangements, such as this one, do not get implemented. They may be tried, but the number of trials is usually very few and of short duration. A crossing of life-styles of institutional organizations is involved in such recomndations, and such crossings are very difficult to bring to fruition in a practical, on-going way.

There are faculties which have a keen sense of the practicalities of teaching, the Temple University faculty appeared to be such a faculty.

These faculty design their programs so that the intern has a maximum of practical experience which they can discuss with the faculty, and which the faculty uses as an integral part of their teaching. The Temple faculty seems to recognize that acquiring a sufficient amount of practical experience at being reasonably successful in teaching is their first priority. They leave the more complex aspects, the more professional aspects of teaching to later periods of the first year, and particularly to the second year of internship.

It needs to be pointed out here that the role of the faculty in supervision has to be studied practically to see what its possibilities are. Most of the discussion about this role is based on experience, and some of the arrangements proposed seem to be somewhat impractical even though they may be good ideas. Supervision is the weakest part of every teacher training program, and we have very few different models to study. This is an area where some experimentation is absolutely required. We are thinking of formal intervention in which different kinds of faculty arrangements and degrees of supervision are formally and systematically tested over a period of no less than five years so that both the problems of developing new arrangements can be pinpointed more sharply and the possibilities of developing new arrangements can be tested.

Perhaps what is needed is a careful delineation of roles and responsibilities beyond that which we have now. If the responsibility for practical training were removed from the universities, such a sharpening of responsibility would take place. But this removal should not be at the expense of the theoretical training, and the enlargement of the interns' visions and possibilities in teaching.

We are not proposing that the internship be cut off from the university but that an arrangement might be created in which the practicing profession becomes primarily responsible for a period of training and evaluation of inductees. University faculty would be responsible for preparing the teacher to be for this intensive experience with his or her colleagues, and would also be responsible for the training of dimensions, including the arts and skills of supervising other teachers. We will discuss this concept in the context of possible variations on present arrangements which might be made to assist the beginning teacher.

What should not be lost sight of in discussing the faculty in supervision, is that unless the faculty can work very closely with the beginning teacher, or the beginning intern, these beginners will experience all of the problems which we have been describing. There is no magic in a status role for helping the beginning teacher. The beginning teacher needs knowledge, needs supervision, needs support, needs someone to watch him or her as they teach and to make suggestions, someone whose experience and wisdom and knowledge they trust. Being a teacher in a school does not automatically make one ready to meet these various needs, nor does being a member of a faculty automatically prepare one. The faculty members, however, have a very practical problem; they are not in the school, they have several interns to supervise usually, and they have to organize their supervisory life around the rest of their teaching life when the interns they are to supervise are at a distance from the students they are to teach. These are practical matters, but the most important is the nature and characteristics of the persons who are to do the supervising.

Supervision ought to be turned over to the best of both groups, the school faculty and the university faculty, to those who understand teaching, are skillful at it, and believe in the importance of supervising the beginning teacher. Until such a cadre of individuals is built up, committed to the task of supervising, and rewarded for doing so, having practical teaching experience will mean little more than floundering and learning by trial and error.

Because of the difficulties in providing these conditions in all training programs, efforts are now being made to put them into programs for beginning teachers who have begun to teach as regular, full-time employees. We turn to the next chapter to a description and discussion of such programs.

Chapter 7

INDUCTION PROGRAMS

This chapter describes the major forms of programs which have been developed for teachers who have already begun to teach. These are programs which assist teachers during the induction phase. They are relatively few in number, our experience with them is limited, but they are amalgamations of ideas and experiences which appear to be promising.

The basic problem which these programs call to our attention is whether there are some aspects of teaching which can be learned only while teaching and if so, how teachers can be helped to accomplish this learning efficiently and with a minimum of trauma or pain.

It has long been argued that some aspects of teaching can be learned only by teaching itself, that the experience of teaching is different from everything which precedes it and cannot be simulated or anticipated in the kinds of experiences which are typically available in preservice programs. The opposite point of view is that approximations from these experiences can be made or that the experiences can be provided if substantial changes are made in the form of the preservice program. The internship was an innovation based upon this idea.

There are those, however, who maintain that until the intern has cut his or her ties with the university, has moved to the community of the school, has become an employee of a school district, is committed to working at a teaching position, or until the beginning teacher sees that their life is now centered in the life of a school and a community, the beginner has not had the genuine, the real, the complete experience of beginner has not had the genuine, the real, the complete experience of teaching. Those who hold this view argue that these aspects of teaching affect the effectiveness of the teacher and may be the source of many of the beginning teachers' problems or interact with these problems to exacerbate them. The issue, therefore, is separated out into three questions: 1) What kinds of skills can be learned in the preservice program which carry over into teaching with a minimum of additional assistance being required to use them in regular teaching? 2) What kinds of skills can not be learned at all or barely without actually teaching in real classrooms on a regular teaching assignment? 3) Does the life which the teacher or teacher in training is living affect their adaptation to teaching?

None of the programs we have described in the preceding chapter on internships or none of the programs which we describe here address this problem directly, nor is it necessary that they should have done so. Internships made the assumption that one could produce training programs that were as close to real teaching as possible and that therefore would be the best form of preservice experience. Those who manage induction programs, particularly where they have been introduced formally as part of the teacher education system, believe that no matter how well the preservice program is conducted, the teacher will need a special form of assistance as soon as they begin regular teaching. Therefore we have no real information from these programs as to whose point of view is more solid. Each can point to its successes which are used to argue the validity of the point of view. Nor does it make much sense to compare them directly because the comparison would be so contaminated by the influence of other factors that no proper conclusion could be drawn.

We are not doomed forever to live with this issue and to decide which approach should be emphasized by what is more convenient or more popular or more likely to be funded. We can choose to organize our teacher education programs so that some of the responsibility for the initial development of the beginning teacher is conducted by school systems in their schools. This idea is attractive to many different people, particularly school administrators who can shape the teaching of the beginning teachers in their system so that it is the kind of teaching which they particularly desire. Others regard that possibility as a potentially disastrous outcome and a threat to developing a truly professional group of teachers.

We will suggest some approaches in the following chapter on research and evaluation which will help us answer questions to resolve this issue. We are not taking the usual position of most researchers when we suggest that these problems can be resolved by some careful research and development. The problem is to find what can be learned where and at what time in one's life so that each teacher becomes an effective teacher who continues to grow professionally. Finding out how that can be done requires systematic study, program development and evaluation, and careful and critical analysis of how we think of our ideas about these problems.

But, as we saw in the chapter on internships, we can learn from the experience which has been gathered in these programs. In this chapter we describe some types of induction schemes. We are heavily dependent for evaluative data on the results of the British evaluation of their programs. In the United States we found only five programs which could be called induction programs but the sources of information on the topic are practically nonexistent. Of those five, two were just beginning, and we were only able to study one in detail. A sixth program that was set up by the State of Georgia, is not typically called an induction program, but it is one in conception and practice. It was created before the term "induction program" had become more or less fashionable. The Georgia program, because it is a state program, addresses many different kinds of issues as well as how to help teachers manage the induction period.

Induction programs fall into three general types: one, the collection of successful schemes used in Great Britain which utilize the notion of a mentor very effectively; two, the Georgia statewide scheme which is coordinated with a comprehensive system of assessment of competence; and the Jefferson County school district system which prepares teachers to conduct a particular kind of program. We have described the Jefferson County program in detail in Volume Two where we have presented the descriptions of the various programs which we have visited.

PREPARING TEACHERS TO TEACH A SPECIFIC CURRICULUM

The program is designed primarily for beginning or new teachers in the Jefferson County school system. Note the use of the word "new", because many of the teachers in the program are experienced teachers who have taught in another school district or teachers who have been substitutes in the district. The purpose of the program is to induct these teachers into the curriculum of the school district. It is not a program to identify the particular kinds of problems they may be having which they might have as beginners irrespective of the kind of curriculum they were teaching. It is not designed to identify deficiencies in teaching skills which could be used in different curricula. It is clearly and unequivocally a program to teach each teacher new to the district how to teach the specific curriculum which has been put in place in that district.

Learning to teach this new curriculum is no small task. The district has completely reorganized its curriculum and has put in place in each of the major areas of the curriculum a program that extends through many of the grades of the system. The program has objectives and content outlined, approaches and strategies, and specific materials which need to be used. The mathematics program is built on a diagnostic prescriptive or a competency-criterion achievement model. The content of the mathematics curriculum in the early grades, for example, is broken up into a number of specific skills or competencies which each child is to learn. These are carefully measured and there is a system for bringing each child up to a desired level on particular competencies. The teacher must manage all these different paths to competence and must keep very precise records about each child's progress, which records are used to report to parents and to the school administration. Similar arrangents are used in other programs but there is variation in the basic concept underlying each strand of the curriculum. The system is not as yet nor does it seem to be planned to be a management by objectives type system. Rather it is a carefully designed and graded program which permits children to proceed at different rates, which requires the use of a variety of materials and strategies carefully perscribed and which requires the teacher to do considerable assessing and reporting of these assessments.

It takes time to learn all about this curriculum. There is no easy way to estimate how quickly such a curriculum could be learned, but the program to teach teachers is conducted over several months. Some of the teachers said they had grasped the basic idea in a particular area within a month of sessions which would be about four full days. But they were usually talking about grasping the basic idea of that particular strand of the curriculum, and they were more or less comfortable with teaching it at different times. Then, of course, having finished their one strand they then moved into another instructional strand. Eventually all teachers were rotated through all strands which they had to teach, so the elementary school teacher had to go through a mathematics, language arts, science, and a social studies strand.

The training sessions were conducted by the curriculum supervisors in each of these areas. The sessions were conducted for an entire day. A certain amount of comradery seemed to have developed among the beginning teachers even though they were teaching in different schools across a very large physical area. But the program was not designed to provide that kind of interaction or the mutual self-help which might result from it.

As we visited the beginning teachers we found that they were learning to use the curriculum at varying rates, though it was not easy to detect why the rates were differential. Some were having difficulties, some were not, and it depended in part on the content area because the various supervisors differed in the extent to which they would work on instructional problems which were superordinate to those of teaching the curriculum. A teacher might be having consirable problems in managing a class. If he or she was having such difficulties, they could get help only if a particular curriculum supervisor saw the solving of that problem as essential to implementing the curriculum, which, of course, it was. But some supervisors took a narrower, but not necessarily limited view of their responsibilities. They helped with the implementation of the curriculum and unless the problem was defined as an implentation problem, they apparently did not offer help. A group of inservice specialists is available to help with classroom and pupil related problems, but none of the beginning teachers we interviewed appeared to know they existed.

There may be many other reasons why some of the curriculum supervisors took this stance. We state unequivocally we are not criticizing them because their position as defined to us did not include the responsibilities of helping the teacher simply become a more effective teacher. To some it may seem shortsighted that their responsibilities would be defined more narrowly, but we repeat, the task of implementing that curriculum which the supervisors did with other teachers as well as beginning teachers is a comprehensive and large task. The supervisors could well believe that they could not get the curriculum in place, which incidently they had helped develop, unless they focussed their attention primarily or exclusively on implementation problems.

In visits of this kind there is no way to obtain adequate data on the range or number of teachers or the characteristics of the teachers who might be having teaching problems. Nor was it easy to detect whether implementing the new curriculum was creating these problems. In some rather obvious cases, we think it was not. For people who were having difficulties, but not insurmountable ones, implementing the curriculum complicated their problems. For some a well defined curriculum was welcomed, a benefit to a beginning teacher which ought not to be overlooked.

The carefully defined curriculum, with its objectives spelled out, its materials suggested or available, with the teaching strategies and evaluation schemas developed is a boon to teachers because it alleviates their planning problems. One teacher expressed great satisfaction that so much of the work was prescribed for her because she knew what to do from day to day, and as we have seen beginning teachers frequently have a problem in this respect. We ought not therefore to underestimate the power of having such a curriculum available as a way of alleviating the problems of beginning teachers.

This fact strengthens one of our earlier statements about the difficulties that are created for beginning teachers because they enter with their content teaching essentially unplanned. In the context of Jefferson County's program, it should not be concluded that having a prescribed curriculum automatically makes life more difficult for the beginning teacher.

Those supervisors who provided help on such problems as management problems were particularly valued by the beginning teachers, and in many ways they may have been even more willing to work hard to implement the curriculum because of this help. There is no question that there was a sub-group of beginning teachers in this system who wanted and needed this kind of help and were very appreciative of it when they received it. This fact also calls our attention to that sub-group of problems which some teachers typically have and which requires apparently special and individual attention.

Should a program of this kind have other forms of assistance to beginning teachers? The alternative of the school district is to select individuals who are unlikely to have these problems, and Jefferson County was in an ideal position for selecting teachers. We have no idea of how successful they were, but certainly the ones we saw were not reporting the kinds of difficulties which would lead us to anticipate their ultimate failure as teachers. Allowing for the fact that the selection processes would not work perfectly in any case, we think that a program of the kind Jefferson County had could easily be supplemented with work of a kind that would help teachers with some basic problems such as management problems. In the case of Jefferson County, the existence of such help should be made more widely known.

The district bears the cost of this program and since the teachers are released for these days of work the cost is substantial. Expanding the program is not an easy decision to make because of these costs. Whenever the cost factor comes to attention, it forces us to think about how money is generally being used to prepare teachers. Assume that we could find a highly efficient way of instructing teachers on the new curriculum, and the sheer scope of the work to be learned still would make the project fairly expensive. But if the teachers were fairly professional, much of that work could be done by the teachers themselves and presumably with somewhat less expense. If the teachers had a set of required skills they ought to be able to master the use of that curriculum fairly easily.

It may be that what a preservice program can do is teach people how to learn about curricula and how to think about implementing it, so that induction programs of this type do not require as much training as they now provide

This seems to us like a rather straightforward instructional design problem, that could in large part be managed by the colleges and universities. THe colleges and universities have rightly resisted teaching about every curriculum that a teacher might be exposed to, but there is another possibility and that is that curriculum development skills or curriculum application skills might well be taught to teachers in training. How to learn about a curriculum ought to be a skill that every teacher has and training for it may not require much other than giving attention to it in the preservices courses.

Since Jefferson County attracts teachers from all over the State of Colorado, and in fact from around the country, it was difficult for Jefferson County to coordinate with every teacher training program from which its teachers graduated. There was no evidence that the system planned to do so. This, as we will see, may be a common difficulty in most induction schemes which to some extent probably weakens them by placing on them burdens which might be avoidable. Again, it is another instance of the lack of coordination between teacher trainers and school districts for facilitating the beginning teacher through the transition period.

We met one teacher who represented probably the best instance of this transition, except that we must qualify that lauditory statement by noting that this teacher had had several years of teaching experience. This was a high school teacher who was assigned to an experienced teacher who did most of the work of inducting him into the curriculum. He had some of the basic skills of teaching under control and obviously was more secure in teaching than a true beginner would be. But he, like all beginners in that district could have been totally lost or overwhelmed by the new curriculum. He worked closely with this other teacher who taught him about the curriculum, guided him through it and provided him with the kinds of assistance which he needed. This case seemed to be an ideal example of how the mentor system works best.

It may be that training and developing mentors of this kind, particularly in the high school where it is somewhat easier for teachers to work together in the course of a day, may be one of the best ways to facilitate beginning teachers through the induction period. Certainly when one sees such an arrangent working well it is easy to believe that this kind of working relationship between an experienced teacher and a beginning teacher is likely to be the best if not one of the best ways of helping a beginning teacher.

There are real difficulties in developing such schemes, the foremost of which is the selection and development of the experienced teacher who will help the beginning teacher. There is also always the problem that such a teacher may shape the beginning teacher in ways that reduce his or her effectiveness because the experienced teacher himself or herself is not using the most effective ways of teaching. This risk is inevitably run in any program and the possibility of it occurring in this kind of an arrangement could be obviated by careful choice of experienced teachers and by training them for this specific task.

In conclusion, we think the Jefferson County program is an excellent example of one kind of an induction program. It is a kind that is best run by a school district. Its design and development depends upon the need of the school district to achieve certain kinds of specific goals. It clearly solves one problem for some beginning teachers, the problem of being prepared to teach on an extended basis. It also places them in a setting which probably helps them solve another problem, namely talking to parents about childrens performance. What they are talking about is not unique to them; they are describing work with which parents will already have familiarity from other teachers.

THE PROGRAM OF THE STATE OF GEORGIA

The program in the State of Georgia is a comprehensive program designed to achieve several different goals. Its major characteristic is that it is a combination assessment, improvent and certification process. One of the most interesting features of this program is the long period of careful development which preceded its implementation. It therefore is a program that is well worth studying and deserves attention in many respects.

All beginning teachers in the State of Georgia are probationary teachers or apprentice teachers. They are not permanently certified. Each of these beginning teachers must pass a criterion referenced test of subject knowledge before they begin to teach. They must also have been recommended for certification by their college or university, which recommendation is a general assessment of their performance competence. They receive before beginning to teach a three year non-renewable teaching certificate. They must meet certain criteria within those three years, and if they do, they receive a permanent certificate.

The State, through a careful program of development, has identified fourteen basic teaching competencies which are identified by forty-five indicators. Beginning teachers must give evidence that they possess each of these competencies to a desired and specified criterion level. The beginning teacher is evaluated early in the first year and at several points from then on until they reach criterion level on each of the competencies.

The assessment of the competence of the beginning teacher is carried out through seventeen regional assessment centers. These regional assessment centers have a staff who gather data on the beginning teacher and who specify prescriptions, which if followed, will help teachers achieve the criterion level of competence. The assessors are called "external data collectors" and they gather information on a set of beginning teachers with respect to the competencies. The beginning teacher is also evaluated on the same competencies by his or her school administrator and by a peer teacher who is generally referred to as a master teacher, but who is also certified in the same area as the beginning teacher. Each beginning teacher is followed by three different individuals, and these three must agree on the level of competence achieved by the beginner and what kinds of remedies are needed if competence has not been achieved. All three evaluators are trained in the assessment process.

We have here a system whose foundation is an assessment of teaching competence. In this respect the Georgia program differs from any program that we know about. The definition of the competencies and the indicators of those competencies give the program substance and direction. The assessment system is clearly established in relation to a set of objectives which are to be measured, objectives represented by the criterion levels defined for each teaching competence.

Ordinarily some people might question that the competencies were irrelevant to whether or not the beginning teacher succeeded. Or a more significant question is whether they are the competencies one needs to master the transition period into teaching. These competencies were developed in several different ways and were subjected to a long period of research-based study. The State funded several different projects whose purpose was to identify and test the validity of certain kinds of teaching competencies. This task was done in several different ways.

One project was located in Dekalb County where the project directors identified a group of teachers who defined an original set of competencies. Then a research project was conducted which studied which of these competencies were related to pupil achievement. Out of this research a basic set of competencies was defined and recommended to the state for use in the program then under development.

A similar project was developed in Carrollton County. Here a group of experts in research on teaching worked with teacher educators and teachers to develop a research project which looked at teacher's performances and related them to certain kinds of achievement outcomes. Out of this they also developed a comprehensive assessment system based on measured competencies.

The State used the results of these various research efforts to develop the final set of fourteen competencies and the forty-five indicators. At the same time, the state began development of its assessment centers and by 1975 was ready to create a number of demonstration centers which would test out the basic ideas of the assessment program. Four of these were created around the state. These demonstration centers basically de-bugged the program. By 1979, the program was in place on a state-wide basis and was being carried out through the seventeen regional assessment centers.

The system of prescriptions which are used when the beginning teacher does not meet a specified level of competence includes a variety of methods. The system is obviously a diagnostic-prescriptive system so no one procedure is systematically or automatically used. The trainee may be assigned to work closely with a master teacher who will instruct the trainee in the particular competencies in which he or she is deficient. Or the trainee may go to some agency which would provide relevant training. A variety of such mechanisms has been used.

The state has been developing this program for almost a decade. The development began in 1972 and 1973, largely as a response to cries for accountability, but also because the state wished to establish a new system of teacher education and certification. The earliest phase consisted in the development of the research projects which we described above. At that time the state put about $250,000 per year into these research projects. Within about four years the state created four demonstration centers which were the prototypes of the regional assessment centers. At that time the state investment rose to $750,000.

The programs are now supported at the rate of about 2.6 million dollars a year. Thees funds are used to support the regional assessment centers and the training activities; the state, for example, provides the money to release the master teacher to work with the teachers.

The State of Georgia program is an excellent example of what can be done when the state invests its policy making power and fiscal resources in the development of a program. The State of Georgia has a comprehensive program which represents a substantial change in the structure of teacher education and in the system for certifying teachers. It appears to be soundly based in sensible practice, and functions well because of the long period of careful development.

There are a number of aspects of this program about which we do not have precise information. Does the program obviate, alleviate, or remedy the problems of beginning teachers? The program was developed as all teacher education programs seem to be, to make highly effective professional teachers, to get the best possible teachers for children that the state could get through means which the state could control. Obviously producing highly effective and professional teachers can happen only if the beginning teachers master the problems of the transition period. But we do know that those problems are critical in the development of the teacher and therefore the question must be asked whether or not this system has either eliminated or ameliorated those problems? It is believed that it has but the factual data are limited. If it has, we are not quite sure why this system works so effectively, except that it has some of the features of the best induction schemes which have been tested empirically.

We think these questions could be anwered rather easily by some careful evaluation, and although we are not in the business or recommending particular places for special funding, certainly a program like that in the State of Georgia ought to be studied very, very carefully for all that can be learned from it. It is an opportunity that ought not to be overlooked.

This program is an interesting contrast to the one which we described in Jefferson County. If both of these programs were systematically evaluated in terms of the affects they have on the immediate success of the beginning teacher in mastering the transition, and since both programs have been in place for a number of years, their long-term effects on teachers could also be studied, we could contrast aspects of each program to get a better idea of whether or not those components make a difference in induction programs. Does the assessment feature contribute something over and above what curriculum instruction contributes, a question which could be answered by comparing the Georgia program with the Jefferson

County program or perhaps some other program. How critical is the specified curriculum? The opportunity for this contrast would be in the data developed from both of these sites.

We have two on-going, well funded programs with substantial experience working with beginning teachers. We really ought to use every opportunity we can create to learn from them.

THE BRITISH INDUCTION PROGRAMS

The British have been concerned since the James report about the transition from preservice training to full-time teaching. The James report had recommended that first-year teachers be given one day a week to go to Teacher Centers where they could receive additional instruction on teaching. This plan could not be carried out because of lack of funds. The James report had itself been preceded by a definitive study of the probationary year (Taylor and Dale, 1971). The Government accepted the James committees' views on induction. In 1973 two pilot schemes for induction were funded, one in Liverpool and one in Northumberland.

The essence of the scheme in Liverpool was that, where sufficient numbers justified the arrangent, teacher-tutors were appointed in each school from among the members of its staff (nursery schools were served by "peripatetic teacher-tutors"). Each teacher-tutor worked with six to eight beginning teachers.

To facilitate working with their teacher-tutors the beginning teachers were released from approximately 25% of their teaching load for this instruction. This instruction initially was organized and supervised by the teacher-tutor and with that teacher-tutor's approval the beginning teacher began to attend a professional Teacher Center one day a week. Here they took courses on the subjects they were teaching and "general professional matters".

The program extended through three years, although the amount of time available for instruction in succeeding years was reduced. In the second year, for example, the beginning teacher worked with the teacher-tutor more and attended the professional Center only one day a week. In the third year the beginning teacher attended the Center for only one-half day every week and spent the remaining half-day on activities arranged by his or her school.

In Northumberland, which is a large rural county, each school with a beginning teacher appointed one of its staff as a teacher-tutor to help the beginning teacher and to coordinate an in-school induction program. The new teachers had three-quarters of a day of release time for induction activities and one-and-a-half days for what are called "block release courses".

These two schemes were essentially based on a combination of direct personal instruction from a teacher-tutor and classwork taken outside of the school. There was also some in-school work.

The provision extended over three years so that considerable training could be provided in that time. There were other variations in the kinds of arrangements which were made to develop and maintain these programs. Some course work was taught in schools or colleges of education. These colleges may have provided evaluators of the pilot projects. They may also have trained teacher-tutors. The tutors received varying amounts of training.

As the report indicates and as can be inferred from much of what has been said, each of these pilot schemes or programs had to work within the realities of the local education agencies in which they were located.

The experience obtained through the conduct of these programs and the evaluation of the programs is reported in a volume entitled, "The Teacher Induction Pilot Scheme" (TIPS Project) whose authors are Bollom, Baker and McMann (1979). This team was primarily responsible for the evaluation.

In most respects these projects are models for an approach to the testing of a pilot project and to its evaluation. Much of the practical nature about how these projects can work is described in great detail in the TIP's volume. We only summarize here the major findings which are consistent with what we have observed about induction programs, though this project had much more comprehensive data than we had.

What is perhaps most interesting about this report is that it reflects the use of evaluation, and the formative evaluations which preceded it, to shape the conception of what induction into the profession ought to be like, how to allocate responsibilities to various agencies and organizations, how to time the various kinds of training programs and activities, the kinds of training which are needed by teacher-tutors and almost every aspect of the conduct of the programs.

Perhaps what is most relevant here are the recommendations which were made on the basis of this evaluation and the experiences accumulated over the years with these programs. The report states that the findings confirmed what investigators had been finding in earlier studies that the "overwhelming concern of most probationers is with the practicalities of their own teaching situation". The investigators then go on to recommend eight different aims that an induction program should have. With one exception, all of these aims are about specific practices or information which the beginning teacher ought to have. They recommend, for example, providing relevant information and advice about their school; providing relevant information and advice about their LEA; providing information and advice relevant to their personal situation outside school (transport, accommodations, social facilities). They recommend providing specific knowledge and advice about teaching techniques. One purpose which is more general is that programs should help promote professional growth and development and not simply survival. The recommendations obviously point to creating a program whose purposes are primarily practical but broad, and with a goal of laying a base for future development.

The teacher-tutor played a critical role in these programs, in fact, was the core of the scheme in our opinion. The recommendations on the teacher-tutor were that the teacher-tutor should be appointed from the school staff in which the beginning teacher was located. This feature means that a teacher in the school would be responsible for helping the beginning teachers in that school. To insure that this role becomes a functional and responsible one, the report recommends paying the tutor on a recognized scale (and not in an ad hoc or per capita basis). It is recommended that they be given two periods of contact time per beginning teacher in each week, that they be responsible for no more than four beginning teachers in the year. They are to be part of a professional development team which in this case is to be led by the deputy head or heads. Their functions are training and not as the report calls it, "pastoral". The tutors are to provide a real service, not merely comfort and support. Some interesting variations on this are suggested for primary schools, such as: the tutor should normally be the "deputy head". The function of these suggestions is to make the tutor's role a substantial role and a recognized position in the school. One of the problems which developed was the relation between the teacher-tutor and the advisors in the local education agency, which is a position like our supervisors. Here the conflict, which might have been anticipated and is certainly understandable, was over the evaluation of the beginning teacher. The teacher-tutor did not have a formal role in the evaluation of the beginning teacher, whereas the advisor did, and apparently there were differences of opinion about the evaluations being made of the beginning teachers. The role of the advisor did change, in part as a result of the innovation of the teacher-tutor role.

Considerable emphasis is given to training tutors, and it is recommended that this training be on-going. The training ought to be focussed around clinical supervision and interpersonal communication.

The report also recommends linking the induction program to the assessment of the probationary period. The probationary period is essentially a time in which the beginning teacher is assessed by the local education agency. The evaluation reports recommend that they be visited at least once each term or three times in all. The observers of these beginning teachers should provide them with feedback and the results of the assessment decision should be given to them. The induction program is obviously an independent way of helping the beginning teacher move through this probationary period successfully.

The report also recommends some matters of national policy, the affect of which would be to make the induction program an integral feature of the teacher education program. These recommendations for national policy include making the 75% teaching load standard for all beginning teachers and for institutionalizing the teacher-tutor role.

The evaluation data indicates that the program was successful in the sense that all the participants or people associated with it or observers of it regarded it as generally a very successful way of inducting teachers into the educational system. The research methods, however, did not include direct observations on any extensive scale, so that it is not possible to conclude that these induction schemes actually produced more effective teachers or eliminated or ameliorated the problems of beginning teachers. The beginning teachers, however, in substantial numbers rated the program as being particularly effective in achieving certain of its aims, such as providing information about the school, helping improve their teaching techniques, and forming sound professional relationships. Interestingly these data are separated by whether these aims were achieved--in the eyes of the beginning teachers--by their internal program, that is the program conducted in their school, or the external programs, that is the programs conducted in the professional centers or the colleges of education. The ratings of the internal program were much higher than those of the external program with one exception. The external program was rated as being more effective in achieving the aim or providing information about the local education agency.

These differences are not surprising because they seem so much like data and other information one has in this country. The beginning teacher is parochial in point of view. What he or she sees himself or herself as needing is information about the school and about specific techniques of teaching which can be used in that school. Other kinds of information of a more general character is probably regarded universally by beginning teachers as not very helpful. This analysis suggests again that the attempt to broaden the perspective of the beginning teacher beyond his or her own immediate needs is probably not very effective during the early stages of their development.

The beginning teachers rated various activities which they found particularly helpful. Among the external activities the one which was rated most highly in this respect was "a visit to other schools". The internal activities which were highly rated were, in order, the additional free time in school, the teacher-tutor, individual discussion with the tutor, observing a colleague teaching, and work on the syllabus. Fifty to 85% of the beginning teachers rated those particular components of their program as effective.

We repeat that the criteria of effectiveness here is whether or not the beginning teachers thought that they were helped. This criterion is an important one, but we ought also in research and evaluation to include criteria such as demonstrated effectiveness, reduction in severity of problems, the facility with which the beginning teacher can take on more complex tasks and other criteria of this character.

The British programs are genuine tests of ideas which have been suggested in this country and which are being tried in a limited number of places. The most interesting aspect of these programs is the use of the teacher-tutor. We know of only one place in the United States where a comparable program is in existence (allow again for incomplete information on our part) and that is in the Teacher Specialist program created in the New York City Teacher Center. These Specialists, however, work with experienced teachers and only with beginning teachers if they hapen to come to the Teacher Center in the school. The evaluation results with these Teacher Specialists are very similar to the results obtained in the evaluation of the British induction program. We also noted in the New York Teacher Center, that some of the teachers who came to the Teacher Specialists might not be too different from a beginning teacher, and perhaps were obtaining for themselves the experiences which they needed when they first began teaching. Most of the teachers, however, came for technical assistance or for activities which would extend their professional development. So it is difficult to compare the two situations, though the similarities are striking.

What we believe we are seeing in these British schemes is something that goes beyond national boundaries. We have noticed that the problems of beginning teachers are not confined to particular cultures, locations, or countries. It should not be surprising then that the most effective solutions in the eyes of the beginning teacher are similar across various boundaries. The type of solution makes considerable sense. The beginning teacher has a person who works with him or her consistently and regularly, who understands their problem and who gives or gets them the help which they need. This experienced person probably inducts the beginning teacher into the informal and formal social systems of the school. If that were true, we would make more of that point than has been made in the evaluation report. It may be that this kind of an integration is more readily achieved in the British schools because of their relatively smaller size, but any evaluation of a teacher-tutor role in future research ought to take into account the functions which this person served in inducting the beginning teacher into the social system of the school.

It is interesting to note, especially after our analysis of the Jefferson County program, that the teacher-tutor can well mediate instruction on particular aspects of the curriculum. This comment is one of many that could be made about the difference between the format or structure of the system of instruction, and the aims of the program. The British programs have much broader aims than the Jefferson County program. The two kinds of programs have entirely different structures. But the aims of the Jefferson County program, we think, could be achieved as well through the British structure as they are being achieved through the system used in Jefferson County. In any future research on induction programs, we ought to separate for the purposes of study, the differences in aims achieved and structures used to achieve those aims. It may be that some structures directly facilitate the achievent of some aims, and it may also be true that some aims may be achieved in a variety of structures. Whatever the empirical realities turn out to be, it is important to distinguish between aims and structure in design of programs and in research on them.

CONCLUSION

We believe that there is sufficient information available on induction schemes to merit their serious attention. The extensive data on the British schemes suggests that certain kinds of problems are likely to be encountered in the development of such schemes. We can build schemes which avoid some of these problems which have essentially been solved for us in these programs. The critical problem, however, which the evaluation essentially leaves unaddressed, is the extent to which the preservice program necessitates the development of the induction scheme. The British have taken it for granted that this transition is necessary for a variety of reasons and on the basis of data which they gathered over a number of years. But we think it is still an answered question as to whether or not the inservice program could not be designed to obviate some of these problems and eliminate or alleviate others. We also found the absence of a role for colleges of education a striking omission in any of these programs.

Chapter 8

THE POLICY STUDIES

If the problems of beginning teachers are to receive the attention that their severity and universality deserve, two kinds of problems must be addressed. One category of problems are those defined by or constrained by policy considerations; the other kind are technical problems. Policy problems are those which depend for their solution on resolution of political differences or points of view. Technical problems are those which are part of the basic problem of helping beginning teachers master the period of transition into teaching.

This chapter presents an analysis of these problems, some alternatives which might be considered for their solution, and proposes methods for initiating the solution of both kinds of problems.

The substance of this chapter can be encapsulated and illustrated in two questions: who will be responsible for developing ways of resolving the problems of beginning teachers? What are effective ways of eliminating these problems or reducing considerably their impact on the beginner's transition into teaching? The first question is primarily, perhaps exclusively, a political question. It is a question of _authority_ and _responsibility_. It is a policy question. The second question asks about _effective means_ for solving a problem. The answer to this question requires empirical study of what problems teachers have and how various methods of assisting them with these problems work in terms of such criteria as reducing the severity of the problem, eliminating the problem, or providing a way of solving it while it is occurring. Such questions are technical in nature.

Although for we will sharply separate these two categories of problems for the purposes of analysis, we recognize that they are interdependent or interconnected. While empirical study might reveal or suggest one or more effective ways of helping beginning teachers with their problems, the decision about who would implement these methods may influence the choice of the methods to be implemented. For example, if the most effective method requires resources which cannot be commandeered by local school districts, the political question of who will be responsible for providing these resources may determine whether this "most effective" method will be used or whether the choice of methods will be affected by political decisions. But if we were to attempt to lay out all of the possible political factors affecting technical decisions and all of the technical decisions or problems which might affect political decisions, we would embark upon an extraordinarily complex task of analysis for which there is little guidance in the current research literature. We are opting, therefore, for spelling out the different kinds of problems in each category, and where it may be relevant, pointing to some ways in which political considerations interact with technical problems and where the solution of technical problems may facilitate or constrain political choices.

A Definition of Policy Problems or Issues

We are using the word "policy" here to mean a high-level and general plan which defines general goals and acceptable procedures which individuals must follow. "High-level" is a relative term which takes on specific meaning in a particular context. The context here is education, a function assigned by the Constitution of the United States to state governments and by them to local agencies, such as county and municipal governments and boards of education--lower levels. Each of these levels may set general goals for those domains of education under each of their jurisdictions. Each may set standards for acceptable procedures to be followed in the administration and conduct of the educational system. Since each of these levels of government may make policy, one of the policy questions is which one will set policies for the induction of beginning teachers into the profession?

Each of these levels of government may set goals within its own jurisdiction and these goals may not be in conflict with those of a higher jurisdiction. Each may also set regulations which define acceptable procedures, and these also may not be in conflict with each other. The various areas of responsibility are fairly clearly defined in law and practice, but policy questions inevitably arise when a new area comes under the instrumentality of policy-making.

Methods, procedures, and programs for helping beginning teachers move smoothly into the profession and become effective teachers have been neglected by policy makers. The state has made three kinds of policies that affect beginning teachers. The first and probably the most important is the policy on tenure by which the beginning teacher is maintained in a quasi-probationary status for a number of years, usually no less than three. This policy on tenure is universal among the states. Another policy is the requirement that a teacher must be certified by the state before he or she can begin to teach. A third policy includes the administrative regulations which permit exceptions to the second policy in the form of emergency credentialling. All states have some kind of a policy in these three respects.

Local education agencies at best have particular programs for orienting the beginning teacher, and as we have seen, there are only a few programs which address themselves to providing assistance and guidance beyond the most basic forms of orientation to the school system. But most school districts have some form of policy on the evaluation of beginning teachers, usually a policy that specifies more frequent evaluations for teachers until a tenure decision has been made about them.

In this section we raise questions about other kinds of policy issues which may pertain to beginning teachers. These are policy issues which will need to be addressed if some form of solution to the problem of beginning teachers is to be mounted and sustained.

Technical Problems

Throughout this report we have raised many technical questions, meaning by a technical question one whose answer could be derived from an empirical study of some form. Can the problems of beginning teachers be aleviated or eliminated by more intensive and extensive experience prior to the formal beginning of teaching? What kind of specific training do teachers need to alleviate or eliminate such problems? At what point in the training or development of a teacher are such problems best addressed? These are questions of fact which can be resolved by careful and thorough empirical study.

As we have indicated in the preceding chapters we are woefully ignorant about such questions. We have, in fact, as a research and development community not studied the problems of beginning teachers except in the most preliminary, and in some cases superficial, ways. Nor have we evaluated carefully the efforts to develop programs which would assist the beginning teacher.

In this section we address these technical problems and suggest their relative priority by proposing how answers to these questions or solution to these empirical problems would help us develop comprehensive solutions for eliminating or alleviating the problems of beginning teachers.

The Pragmatics of Developing Solutions

If there are both policy and technical problems which must be resolved, then both political and technical strategies for solving these problems must be developed. Many individuals go immediately to critical political problems such as the financing of potential solutions, even though they could not at the present time propose a demonstrably effective method or program of solutions for solving the problems of beginning teachers. Others define the technical problems in terms of research questions so relatively remote from developing a problem solution that the allocation of resources to these relatively abstruse questions invites political analysis of the problem rather than support for empirical study. Any approach to these problems must therefore be linked to lines of activities which can be interrelated and practically carried out.

There must be a program of research and evaluation and demonstration and development which is coordinated with the development of practical programs whose effectiveness can be measured. This strategy must be coordinated with the discussion and analysis of political considerations which inevitably will shape the ultimate solution.

Whether the approach is political or empirical and whether the political and empirical are coordinated or not, the central question is how can we help beginning teachers master the transition into teaching so that they will be more effective teachers and will continue to develop professionally? If agreement can be reached on this definition of the problem and the criteria which are stated in its definition, then the kinds of political solutions and the kinds of research strategies needed will be more apparent. Therefore in the analysis and discussion in this chapter we will point continually to the application of the criteria stated above and will suggest the ordering of these policy and technical problems in terms of these criteria.

In the State of Georgia, for example, the criteria of effectiveness was paramount in the policy-making decisions. The program was clearly linked to both measuring effectiveness and providing a way of developing it. Thus the Georgia program is practical in the sense that it has a clearly defined goal and clearly established means for attaining that goal; its effectiveness in these respects can be measured and the means chosen evaluated. The policy making has also established who will be responsible for the development and maintenance of the program -- the State itself. In all of these respects therefore the Georgia program is eminently practical because it has settled the major policy issues and has laid out a technical strategy of plausible effectiveness.

In discussing policy issues we will discuss the practicalities of various solutions to both policy and technical problems. But we offer these as ways of stimulating wider discussion among policy makers and educators; they are not offered as the definitive products of analysis and empirical investigation.

What follows then is a presentation which describes the major policy issues and possible solutions of them. These solutions will be evaluated analytically in terms of the criteria of whether or not the solution is likely to produce more effective teachers, whether it will produce teachers who will continue to grow professionally after the period of the transition and whether or not the program appears to be feasible administratively and fiscally.

THE POLICY ISSUES AND PROBLEMS

There are three kinds of policy issues or problems in all governmental activities. The first of these is the issue or problem of authority and responsibility. The issues surrounding questions of authority and responsibility are who will be responsible for the development, the administration, the evaluation, the financing of a strategy for attaining particular goals? Who shall set the goals? Who will regulate the means by which these goals may be attained? A second policy question is who must be involved or should be involved in the development of the overall statement of goals and the elaboration of accepted procedures for attaining these goals? This policy question describes the diffusion of responsibility across various agencies and groups. A subordinate political question, which is not necessarily the same as a policy question, is who should be consulted on policy-making? This decision is usually effected by two facts, one, who is affected by the policy and two, who has the power to influence how the decision about policy will be made? A third area of policy-making pertains to the provision of fiscal resources for the carrying out of a particular program. What agency has the power to collect revenues to support a solution? What constraints are there on the distribution of these resources for various purposes, particularly the anticipated purpose for which policy is being made? Should this fiscal responsibility be shared among various agencies of government?

Each of these areas of policy-making are inevitably interconnected, and policy-making may begin in any one area and spread into other areas. Tracing all of these connections and interdependencies is a study in itself and we can at best anticipate some possible interrelations and point to them and how they might affect the solution to the overall problem with which we are concerned. Most solutions would require additional fiscal resources or redistribution of available resources. The feasibility of either obtaining additional resources or of being able to redistribute available resources is likely to determine who will assume authority and responsibility for a policy. Or the agency which has the most authority may be able to impose a fiscal solution on other agencies. In many cases these interdependencies are particularistic and local, so we at best can point to some possibilities, but as we have said earlier a general analysis of these various independencies would be a political science investigation in itself.

Political Considerations

It is obvious that policy making is not a pristine intellectual task conducted in isolation. Most policy making goes on in the maelstrom of politics and is inevitably and perhaps always affected by political considerations which at times seem remote from the issues of the policy making itself. It might be proposed that interships be adopted as part of the program of training teachers because the policy makers believe that the internship will alleviate the problems of beginning teachers and yield more effective teachers. This kind of policy making has been undertaken in the State of New York. But before such a policy can be initiated, it would need to receive the support of important groups, most notably the teachers' organizations.

The teachers' organizations might share the belief that the internship is likely to be an effective way of inducting teachers into the profession and helping them to be more effective. But the teachers' organizations have a variety of other considerations such as the availability of jobs for their members. If the proposed policy on internships seem to threaten the availability of jobs for teachers, the teachers' organizations could not support the strategy even though they may believe in the concept. Even if the proposed strategy did not affect their members directly but appeared to, they might not be able to support it. To develop a policy in ignorance of these political considerations or to ignore them on the assumption that an agency has sufficient power to enforce a solution is both foolish and short-sighted. There is little excuse for ignorance or for failing to consult all agencies on matters relevant to their interests.

Since political consideration means balancing costs and benefits of different groups, the work of studying the political considerations is always a local and particularistic problem. At best here, we can point to certain kinds of political considerations which we have heard about as we talked to various individuals in the sites that we visited, and our advisors and others. In one state, for example, there is a periodic attempt by some institutions to eliminate the intern credential, the credential which permits the intern to conduct classes while in the process of being trained. Such moves seem to be inspired by political motives though the public rhetoric supporting them espouses the noblest cause. But there is little that can be generalized from such events other than to say programs have political enemies and one ought to be alert to what these enemies may do. We will take occasion to point out problems of this kind, to suggest some of the bases for opposition to ideas or programs or methods, and in this way alert all parties concerned to the political aspects of the policy making process.

Political Considerations in Technical Problems

Although it may appear that technical problems can be isolated from political influence, in practice this possibility may not be realized. The beginning teacher has problems which may not be of interest to researchers; one suspects this is the case because this area of problems has been so neglected by the research community. The influence of teacher organizations may move the study of these problems up on the agenda of agencies which fund research.

Or particular kinds of solutions may be more attractive to teachers' organizations or to groups of teacher educators who will advocate the study of those particular strategies as a first priority. Or these various groups may give priority to the study of policy problems such as the resources for funding any special programs. We are suggesting quite directly that research questions must compete in a political arena for their funding. Again we will point to information we may have gathered about such political considerations that may influence either the definition of a research question, the acceptable mode of studying it, or its priority and how such considerations might influence the solution of technical problems.

We have indicated that there are three areas of policy making which are the locus of issues and problems in policy making. One of these is the area of authority and responsibility, the second of the political viability of the policy, and the third, the fiscal responsibility for the implementation of the policy If policy making is to be done with respect to the problems of beginning teachers, we will find that policy issues arise in each of these areas. In this section we will describe in turn each of these areas of policy making and suggest solutions which have either been proposed or could be proposed and evaluate in a modest way these proposed alternatives.

Why is policy making a topic for discussion and analysis when we are considering the problems of beginning teachers? Is policy making necessary? Is it desirable? Perhaps this problem would benefit by being ignored. Perhaps the solution to the problem should be kept open by permitting anyone interested in the problem to attempt a solution. These questions are prior to any formal policy making.

Our answer to these questions is the following. The problems of beginning teachers occur because the beginning teachers appear to be unable to cope with the transition into teaching easily. It is a period of great strain and stress which appears to substantially affect their effectiveness initially, and may affect it permanently. How the beginning teacher copes with this problem also determines the kind of teacher they probably will be for much of their professional career. If, therefore, most teachers are having difficulties with this period, and if these difficulties are limiting their potentialities as teachers, then the problem of the transition period must be addressed by some agency which can help beginning teachers master this transition.

But at the present time no agency has assumed formal responsibiiity for helping beginning teachers master the transition. A solution to the problem has to be generated by some agency which can be responsible for helping beginning teachers during the transition period.

The first step will be to embark on a program of policy making which will define who will be responsible for developing strategies for helping beginning teachers. Once we have decided that policy making is necessary then we must address the kinds of issues and problems which will arise inevitably as policy is made.

THE ISSUE OF AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

The first and primary issue is who will be responsible for solving this problem. Three agencies presumably could set policy on strategies for preparing or helping the beginning teacher: the state, local school districts and county agencies, or training institutions. A case could be made for each of these agencies setting policy.

The Case For The State Assuming The Role Of Policy Maker

If the period of transition is seen as an extension of the period of training, the state clearly could set a policy on how that period will be structured. There is a precedent for this position. States are moving in the direction of making the first year or more a period of probation;

the beginning teacher would be given a probationary license. The state may require additional training during this period. For example, the Newman Commission in New Jersey has proposed that a permanent Professional Certificate would be awarded after two years of a successful "experience" and additional advanced work equivalent to a Master's degree in education. The State of Georgia has established a probationary period.

The State of New York used its policy-making powers to develop proposals for a new system of teacher licensing. The State Department of Education created a task force to study and to recommend changes in the system of teacher education and certification. This task force subsequently proposed the use of a licensing examination and a year of internship as the basis for the permanent certification of teachers. The Commissioner of Education and his staff and consultants then converted these recommendations into policy recommendations to be made to the Board of Regents, who in turn will vote these policy recommendations or the modifications in them into policy statements which will create a new structure for permanently certifying teachers in New York State.

The State of Georgia engaged in a similar process of consultation and development prior to the initiation of its plan. The state, under the leadership of the State Superintendent of Instruction, Jack Nix, supported several research projects on teaching competence. The data from these research projects plus consultations with groups of teachers were used to establish a set of basic teaching competencies which all beginning teachers would have to demonstrate they had. The purpose of the evaluation system is to estimate whether these beginners do have the competencies, and the assistance that is provided them is assistance to achieve the required competence.

Both the work in the State of New York and in the State of Georgia illustrate how the superordinate agency can create policy which creates a system which affects how agencies at the lower levels will function. In both cases critical individuals in responsible positions in the state believed that the system of teacher education and certification had to be improved substantially and set up the procedures by which plans for changes in the system could be carried out. Both of these reforms are dramatically different from other kinds of changes which occur or have occurred in teacher education.

The value of having the higher agency develop the policy is that it is a policy for all of the teacher candidates in the state. The benefits of such a policy are that different standards for training and evaluation are not maintained in different places in the state, so that equity is insured. Also, the state may well enlarge the possibilities for training through its influence or through the resources which it brings to bear. The State of Georgia, for example, is investing a considerable amount of money in this program. On an annual basis, the state is providing 2.6 million dollars for 17 Regional Assessment Centers. During the early years of the development of this program, the state provided about $250,000 a year; after the period when four demonstration centers were set up, the state provided $750,000 a year, of which $50,000 to $350,000 was used for development and the remainder for the four demonstration centers. Obviously the state commandeered these kinds of resources and had the clear interest in the use of its resources for the purposes to be achieved by setting up this program.

The arguments against the state taking the lead in policy making in solving the problems of beginning teachers is the usual case of the extension of state authority over local authority. Despite the allocation of power over education to the state, the strong tradition in this country of local autonomy of educational institutions creates a base of opposition to any encroachment of the state system on the agencies lower in the hierarchy of agencies.

These arguments will persist and be renewed year after year because they are part of the basic ideological struggle between federal power and state power that has characterized life in the United States since the founding of the republic. This is not to dismiss either the relevency or significance of these arguments but simply to point out that such arguments will always be made whether the topic is the state-aid formula for education, certification requirements, the standards for the evaluation of teacher-training institutions, or policies for assisting beginning teachers with their problems. The skirmish will be fought over and over again and will be resolved in ways that are consummate with the temper of the culture of the state and the temper of the times when the issue of authority is raised.

The practical questions are twofold: 1) does the state have the power, the authority, and the responsibility to develop educational programs on a state-wide basis? 2) should the state interpose its authority in the area of beginning teachers' problems? The answer to the first question is unequivocally "yes." The arguments are about the second question. Usually two principles are invoked in making a decision and answering the second question. One of these principles we have already used, namely, the prevalence of the problem and its interconnection with other aspects of education with which the state is essentially concerned. The second argument is that the state can commandeer the resources which no other agency can commandeer to solve the problems, so that an effective solution is likely to be achieved only if the state uses its authority and assumes the responsibility for the solution of the problem.

There is no question that the problem is widespread and, therefore, not unique to particular training institutions or particular school districts who might object, if the problem were unique. The problem is also interrelated to a variety of other problems. The solution to the problem of beginning teachers is related to the quality and character of the teacher-training program, to the standards for certification, to the requirements for the evaluation of teachers for tenure. The problem is, therefore, a critical and core problem in the system for the production and utilization of effective and competent teachers.

On the question of whether or not the states' authority is the most practical means of bringing a quality program into existence. We can rely on our experience over the decades with various forms of innovation in teacher education. The internship for example, has been in existence for over 20 years. It is beyond question a successful demonstration of one way of training teachers that seems to be, in the absence of hard empirical data, an effective and perhaps a superior way of training at least high school teachers. But, as we have pointed out in numerous places, the internship has not spread, and one reason is the lack of a system that makes a change of this kind attractive, useful, or necessary. It is claimed that resources are needed to begin internships and, again in the absence of hard fiscal data, the argument is plausible but not compelling. But the belief of many people that funds are necessary has kept many of them from attempting to undertake internship programs. Whatever the "true reasons," the necessity for action "from the outside" seems indisputable, otherwise the internship program would have spread more extensively than it has.

Another major reform in teacher education which has gone nowhere is the competency-based teacher-education movement. This movement originated largely in a small number of colleges of education which undertook to revamp their programs. For about a half a decade there was considerable discussion in the educational community about these programs, but they did not spread. Annual reports showed essentially the same numbers of colleges with programs in place and other colleges reporting that they were "discussing" revising their programs to a competency-based system.

Only when a state intervened and required competency-based teacher-education programs, as in New York State, did such change take place. When the state in this case brought its authority to bear on the matter, movement began to occur. Now New York State again is likely to require an internship, albeit different than the ones described here, and we will see the development of an internship program.

We may disagree on the ultimate wisdom of these changes, or their ultimate effectiveness, or whether in fact real change was produced, but in reality no change occurred from traditional programs until some form of supra-institutional authority was used to bring about the change. It should be noted that we are not advocating any particular kinds of change. Rather we are suggesting that if changes are to occur, states will probably have to assume the major policy-making role which will give direction and leadership to the development of programs for the improvement of teacher education and particularly for the development of means of assisting beginning teachers. We are not assuming that the state authority will be used in any particular way, for example, by requiring the colleges to take on this problem. The state presumably could require programs for beginning teachers in the school districts of the state, or it could set up a program independent of either the local districts or the training institutions.

The Case for the Training Institutions

Some individuals may argue that the colleges should extend their programs into the years of beginning teaching. The internship in a way provides us with a model of what might be done in that respect. The University of Oregon program is a clear example of a structure which carries the work of the college or university into the fifth year, during which the trainees are in an internship program. The University of Oregon program is notable because it has concentrated its interns (Resident Teachers) in several different sites and assigned clinical staff to work with the interns at these sites. There they receive both individual supervision and instruction, and course work. Because this program is built on the pre-service program, the fifth year is a year built around the internship experience and is not, as in other internships, a form of the pre-service program.

The implementation of this model on a widespread basis would probably require some form of state action to put it in place in the system of teacher education. The training institution obviously acted as a research and development and demonstration center. But the training institution can influence other institutions only by persuasion or the power of demonstration, and as is apparent in the history of teacher education particularly, this power is notably weak. Other institutions do not imitate the innovators; some do, most do not.

We should not confound two aspects of the case being made here. One aspect is that the appropriate place for the development of such programs is in the colleges; the other is the issue we discussed above--whether or not the system developed will be put into place unless the state exercises its authority to encourage or require the development of the new program. These two aspects should be kept separate.

There is a romantic belief about or image of the university as a center of innovation and development whose power and influence is such that other institutions will follow. While this is more or less true in American education generally, the image is a relatively weak one. In the state of Oregon, for example, the University of Oregon is one of the two major state universities and clearly one of the centers of higher education in the state. But despite the successful demonstration of its internship program, other colleges in the state have not followed its lead. The myth of innovative leadership on which the case for counting on the training institutions to bring about a solution to a particular problem does not seem to be the kind of myth that compels action.

Another argument against relying on the training institution to stimulate widespread development and implementation of strategy for solving the problems of beginning teachers is that the teacher-education program lives in an economy of scarcity where it must compete for the university's or college's resources with other fiercely competitive departments. Some training institutions simply would not be able to mount an innovative program even if they wanted to because their institution would not provide the necessary resources. Or, other departments may resist changes in academic structures. (At Stanford for years the Committee on Graduate Degrees raised questions about credits being given for the internship experience. Although the point of view behind the questions did not prevail, it reflected the belief that internship-type experiences did not deserve academic credit or very little academic credit. Princeton University only within the past several years has awarded any academic credit for student teaching.)

What the training institutions can be called upon to do is to conduct the research on such programs, to develop and test them, and to provide alternative models. The State of Georgia called on different institutions in the state to take on the development of different aspects of its total program. As its basic work progressed to a point where it could be molded into a demonstration model, four demonstration centers were set up, some of which were under the supervision of the academic institution. But again we see the influence of the state in creating the system which brought the total program into full existence, and it is hard to believe that these changes would have occurred if the problem of developing ways of solving the problems of beginning teachers were turned over to the original training institution.

There is an argument against turning these matters over to the training institutions which could be stated, though it is of unknown validity and is certainly not flattering to the original training institution. To state it bluntly, this argument is that the training institutions did not solve the problem when they had the trainees as their students, therefore one should not expect them to be able to do much about it after the trainees graduate--the historical record is against them. It is true that the trainees do complain about the programs through which they went, usually claiming that these programs did not prepare them adequately for the experiences of initial teaching. As we have pointed out, this claim probably has some validity, but we really do not know whether the fault should be attributed to deficiencies in the program or whether other factors are responsible for the creation of these problems. But the belief that the university or college has somehow defaulted in preparing teachers to cope with beginning teaching is apparently widely believed and probably has some validity. Arguments to turn over to the training institutions the development of remedies to this situation seem to many people to be illogical, and as long as this belief persists such a complete turnover of responsibility seems unlikely to occur.

Certainly one of the problems which should be solved by future research is the problem of how the training programs affect the beginning teachers' ability to cope with the transition. We assume now that the widespread failure of beginning teachers to master the transition period easily and the difficulties which they seem almost universally to experience results from inadequacies in the college program. This connection remains to be demonstrated. We suspect that it is partially true--that there are tasks of teaching on which beginning teachers could have more training and with which they could have more experience during the training period.

Even if greater precision is developed in assessing the sources of the problems of beginning teachers, and it turns out that weaknesses in the training program are responsible for only a portion of the problems which beginning teachers have, it still will be necessary to persuade individuals in other institutions or agencies or groups that the colleges and universities are equipped to help teachers with the transition period.

The Case for Local School Districts

The case for using local districts to develop programs for the beginning teacher rests on three different arguments. First is the general point of view that experienced teachers and local teachers and administrators are best equipped to help the new school teacher in their system. These more experienced people are practical, aware of the problems of beginning teachers having gone through them themselves, know what needs to be done, and are probably more understanding. The second argument is that the beginning teacher is an employee of the local system, will be evaluated by that school system, and hopefully will obtain tenure in it. Therefore, the school systems have a stake in how that teacher makes the transition and ought to be responsible for assisting the beginning teacher. The third argument is that in any case the beginning teacher will have to adapt to the curriculum of the school and meet the needs of the pupils in that school, problems which are particularistic in character and cannot be solved by general programs.

Each of these arguments has obvious validity and although they tend to be somewhat overstated, make a persuasive case for programs developed by local school systems. We know that there is experimentation in England, as we described earlier, which tells us that such programs can be successful, and we saw at least one program in this country which served its purpose reasonably well in orienting the beginning teacher to the school districts' curriculum. The arguments against turning this problem over to local systems are equally persuasive but of a different character. First, the school district must use its resources primarily for the education of the children in the district. Although it may be argued that improving the effectiveness of teachers in the schools is to the benefit of children, programs for beginning teachers look more like bringing teachers up to a standard which they ought to have been able to meet upon graduation from the training institution. It appears as if the school district is supplying training which some other institution ought to have provided, and therefore cannot justify using local tax money for that purpose.

The second argument against turning such programs over to local school districts is that the districts cannot uniformly mount the resources for constructing such programs. This argument is important only if there are no other sources of aid. The state, for example, could supplement the funds in the district for this purpose. The State of Georgia picks up the expenses of its Regional Assessment Centers, provides training for local administrators and peer teachers to observe and evaluate the beginning teacher, provides substitute money when a teacher in a district is going to work with a beginning teacher. Such arrangements indicate that the state could if it chose, make sure that each district had a viable program.

The third argument against turning the responsibility and authority for the solving of these problems over to the local school districts is that their interest in assisting the new teacher may be merely parochial. We have seen some evidence of this possibility in the program which we observed at Jefferson County in Colorado. Individual supervisors in that program did give more assistance than that required to implement the curriculum, but their official responsibility was to make sure that the beginning teacher thoroughly understood the new curriculum and how to put it in place. It is also true that in every place a teacher teaches he or she works with a particular curriculum, and has to learn how that curriculum is used in the school in which he or she is teaching. Also, some of these curricula are sufficiently alike so that learning how to use one is learning which can be transferred to learning how to use another. In other words, this argument, while important, is not totally compelling, but local school districts, as a source of authority and responsibility for initiating new teachers into the profession, is suspect on the grounds that their interests are limited to those of an employer and to those aspects of effective teaching which are more specifically relevant to the goals and curricula of their schools. If, however, it is eventually demonstrated by research that effectiveness in teaching is the product of progressive development from the use of a limited number of skills relevant to or specific to a particular curricula and particular pupils to greater diversification in the use of such skills across different groups of pupils and curricula, then this argument has practically no meaning.

As in all of the discussions throughout this report, we must always return to the fundamental problem: How does the transition period in the life of teachers fit into their development? How does it affect their effectiveness? How does it stimulate or inhibit their professional development? Until these kinds of questions can be answered with sufficient precision, it is very difficult to decide who is best equipped to develop and conduct a program.

On the basis of the arguments in this section, it seems reasonable to conclude that if any action is to develop which will lead to programs for helping beginning teachers, the state must play the significant role in setting policies, developing general structures, relating these structures to the credentialing process, and perhaps providing some, if not all, of the fiscal resources for the development of a program. But it is equally clear that the colleges and universities and the local school districts can be the developers of programs, either independently or jointly, which would be part of the overall schema developed by the state. But we cannot allocate the responsibility for this developmental task precisely until we understand somewhat better what is needed by the beginning teachers in the way of help or guidance or prior preparation.

We do not mean to imply that this policy decision cannot be made. It seems to us that a decision can be made that if change cannot be made to occur and to improve the situation we have been studying in this report, then the state can begin to take leadership. Georgia has provided a model of progressive development carried out over an eight-year period. It has also demonstrated how resources can be allocated to seed the development of different kinds of programs and to produce some basic data which can be used in setting standards and goals. It also has illustrated how as this development occurs demonstration centers can be set up which provide a base for experimentation and evaluation. In a system of progressive development of this kind it is possible to integrate research and development and to pilot programs which can be evaluated.

Great Britain has provided us the model of how pilot programs in school districts can be established. We have our own experience from the late 50s and 60s and what is known about the existing internship programs to guide us on how such programs can be developed or modified. We have the example of New York State setting up a system for taking leadership in policy-making on a strategy which would improve the effectiveness of beginning teaching and has the potential for providing a situation in which beginning teachers can learn to solve their problems efficiently and with less strain and stress than they now experience.

However, in our judgment, the core of all this activity must be a research path which studies the development of teachers from the preservice through the induction phase into the first levels of professional development. Knowledge acquired by this study will tell us what kinds of problems these programs need to solve. We will say more on this topic in the chapter on research.

Conclusions

The basic conclusion of this analysis of the policy issues is that the states should provide the leadership for a program for the development of a strategy for solving the problems of beginning teachers. We see no other way in which such programs are likely to be mounted, and it seems a reasonable conclusion from what we now know that the state must assume authority and responsibility for the development of the structures which will carry such programs. Training institutions and local school districts can be the sites for the development of such programs and for the implementation of them during an initial phase of experimentation.

ORCHESTRATING POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The development of new programs or new structures for developing programs or developing ways of bringing together institutions which have not previously cooperated on the problem inevitably involves political considerations or problems. A policy issue is what level of government shall be responsible for orchestrating these political considerations? Such a question can be answered only if we are reasonably certain on what the scope is of the problem to be solved, how many individuals or groups have a stake in the solution or are affected by its solution, and who must be consulted on the methods chosen to solve it.

In this case of the problems of beginning teachers, as we have said repeatedly, there are no structures for mediating a solution. Such structures have to be created, and, therefore, different kinds of groups who have a concern with the beginning teacher will need to participate in the decision-making or be consulted about it or be evaluated for the political influence which they can bring to bear on the problem. Consider that the problems of beginning teachers are as broad in scope as the unit of administration for all of the teachers in the state, namely, the state agencies themselves. Second, consider that the solutions to this problem must generally influence beginning teachers in the same way so that each will have an opportunity to become as effective as possible and to progress professionally. These requirements of the problem's solution suggest that the state must also orchestrate the political considerations which will affect the problem's solution.

There are three groups which obviously have an interest in how this particular problem is solved. First, and perhaps of most importance, is the teacher organization in the state because any programs that are undertaken affect both the character and quality of their members and the conditions of work of their members. Programs involving the use of experienced teachers may impose burdens on these experienced teachers for which they are not recompensed adequately, either in time or money. The teacher organizations may not want their teachers to assume the major responsibility for the development of beginning teachers, or they may see that they have a proper stake in this matter but wish to insure that experienced teachers are not exploited by school administrations or by the state to provide training for these beginners. The state or the local school district could impose or try to impose programs which essentially change contractual arrangements with the various teacher locals in the state or which have the potential for changing these provisions.

A subtler aspect of this problem is improving the quality of those entering the profession and how this improvement affects those who are already in the profession. There is some fear among teachers that as standards for beginning teachers are raised, administrators will impose these standards on teachers who are already in the profession who may not have had the opportunities for training which the beginners have had. The argument makes sense in that school boards will want the best for their pupils, and if beginning teachers are of a higher quality because they are receiving special help, their performance sets the standards for the performance of other teachers who have not received that same help.

If school boards, instead of providing similar kinds of help, simply increase the rigor or rigidness of their evaluations of teachers or try to pressure teachers into moving or resigning because they have not had the same opportunities for development, then this approach leads to conflict of particularly undesirable kinds.

There is some resistance to the participation of teacher organizations in decisions about the training of teachers. Historically, teachers in their organizational role have not participated in these decisions or have done so only in a very limited way. Considerable change is taking place in that situation and has been during the past decade. New York State, in in setting the standards for competency-based programs, required that policy boards be established of which teachers were members, and New York State United Teachers made every effort to insure that the teacher organization would participate in the selection of teachers for these policy boards. Federal programs in the past decade have required the participation of teachers in the development of training programs for experienced or pre-service teachers. But to the degree that the nature of the training program is closely tied to the achievement of certificates or licenses, the decisions about these programs still are regarded in many quarters as belonging to the training institutions or the administration of local school districts. It seems to us that these attitudes can be maintained only if one ignores the genuine stake that teacher organizations have in the quality of the entrance to the profession.

We point here to the attitudes that can be observed in different groups. These attitudes can be most clearly seen in the opposition to the model legislation which the National Educational Association advocates for the creation of licensing commissions. These commissions in the NEA legislation are composed of a majority of teachers, and this group would have primary responsibility for setting standards for licensing and certification and for programs which prepare people for these licenses and certificates. Historically, such power has been allocated either to a state agency or to a different kind of state board, such as the State Board of Examiners in New Jersey.

It has been a struggle to establish these kinds of commissions. In California, for example, a commission originally created for this purpose had a minimum of teachers on it originally and teacher organizations had relatively little influence on the appointment of these individuals. Gradually this system changed as the California Teachers Association exercised more pressure to change the situation and the commission now contains a larger number of teachers chosen from slates prepared by the California Teachers Association. The activities of the California Teachers Association and the resistance to them illustrate the kinds of attitudes, essentially political in character, that affect how teachers' interests in such matters as licensing, credentialing, and training are treated. Any new program or strategy for assisting beginning teachers will elicit the same kinds of reaction on both sides. Therefore, it is essential that an agency capable of orchestrating such political considerations take the responsibility for policymaking. Obviously the state agency is in the best position to orchestrate these various political influences so that a program acceptable to the various constituencies can be developed.

The training institutions have an interest in what happens to their graduates, especially insofar as decisions about these programs reflect back on the competence which they have brought to the original training. Training institutions might be expected to oppose programs which suggest or imply that the original training was inadequate. They are particularly sensitive to shifting the training responsibility to school districts because the conclusion might be drawn that they themselves could not carry this responsibility adequately and competently. Training institutions fear the demise of their programs if others take over aspects of them or if others seem to be able to mount substitutes for these programs. Training institutions are also sensitive to programs which might reduce the need for faculty, particularly at a time of declining enrollments. If the responsibility for student teaching and its supervision were shifted to school districts, the structure of the pre-service program would be gutted, and the needs for faculty would also be drastically reduced in many places.

The local school districts' stake in programs for beginning teachers may be more immediate than their stake in how they are prepared initially. If the program for beginning teachers is to be mounted in the district, the district will want to insure that it is relevant to their needs. They are also not likely to forego their evaluation function which will somehow have to be integrated into any system which occurs in time after the beginning teacher has left the pre-service program. Historically, school districts have been less concerned about the particularities of the training programs, except insofar as they produce teachers who are not very effective, but their influence on these programs has been extremely limited in the past.

The local school systems see themselves as employers, and their primary responsibility as the selection of the best teachers. They are, therefore, concerned primarily with the selection process and secondarily with the training process. They rightly, as we suggested, do not believe that they should carry the primary responsibility for training or for the full professional development of the teachers.

Conclusion

We have presented here a picture of interests in any program for beginning teachers where the interest might conflict if changes are to be made in this program. At the present time, as long as the responsibility for helping the beginning teachers to move to the transition period seems to be allocated to the pre-service program, other constituencies such as teacher organizations and school boards and local school administrations can have a moderate influence on these programs at best. Their principal activity seems to be to complain about the products of these programs, but there is no active role which they can seek in the development and improvement of these training programs. The colleges and universities must seek them and their participation before any realistic involvement is likely to develop. But, if one is considering changes in this system to improve the ability of beginning teachers to master the transition period, the interests of the school boards and local administrations are much more likely to be directly affected if these programs are to be conducted in the period after the pre-service has been officially completed.

Again the case can be made that the state is the appropriate agency to attempt to reconcile and orchestrate these conflicting interests and to make sure that a program acceptable to all parties is developed.

Here, we point again to the State of Georgia which seems to have worked out the ways of obtaining the support and satisfaction of the various groups. The State of New York similarly has involved relevant individuals in its task forces and its advisory committee on teacher education.

The choice seems to be among leaving matters as they are now, which is obviously a poor solution, or diversifying the responsibility, which does not appear to be much of an improvement, or of creating a statewide system for a program for beginning teachers. If the last alternative is chosen, and we are directly and indirectly arguing that case here, then the state is the appropriate forum for the orchestration of a variety of political interests of different constituencies.

THE ISSUE OF FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

We have said sufficient about fiscal resources in the preceding sections to make it clear first that the training institutions have no way of raising additional resources and, because of their competitive position within colleges and universities, may not be able to mount new programs in addition to the ones they are already maintaining. Second, local school districts always face the problem of the allocation of local taxes to functions that are indirectly related to the education of children. The training of beginning teachers in an extensive way would most likely create a problem for local school districts. But, either of these institutions could receive fiscal assistance from the state to mount programs for beginning teachers.

We have not done an analysis of state budgets so that we can identify resources that the state could allocate to programs for beginning teachers.

It may be that state agencies will have to reconsider priorities so that programs for beginning teachers can be merged into other kinds of programs and supported. Or, legislation may be required which will establish programs by funding for them. Fiscal matters do not seem to be of a character for which general solutions are immediately obvious. They are so political in nature that solutions have to be worked out state by state. We have a few comments on the possibilities of redistribution of resources. In a time of declining enrollments, we are excising sufficient numbers of teachers in local districts. Many of these teachers might be diverted into the training of beginning teachers. The state, as in Georgia, might pick up the cost of using teachers in this way. The problem, of course, is that not all teachers would necessarily be suited to this task, but if a program of training were established, again as it has been in Georgia, it would be possible to utilize the resources of the state, not only to ameliorate the trauma of unemployment facing the teaching profession but equally important to use the talents and abilities of teachers to improve the quality of their profession and to retain them in the teaching force until such time as they may be needed again in the ranks of classroom teachers.

It may be that the federal government could play a role in supporting such a program with the state matching funds. Such an approach means that we recognize that we have an established pool of experienced teachers for whom we do not have classroom jobs but who may continue to play a significant role in the training of teachers. Money funneled into states and matched with state monies might very well provide a cadre of experienced trainers of teachers who could develop the basic structures for programs for beginning teachers.

As the state assumes larger amounts of the financing of education programs, as seems likely in the decades ahead, it could also assume greater responsibility for creating programs of improved effectiveness for teachers. We ought to recognize that the state in the case of tax-supported institutions is, in fact, subsidizing in large part the training of teachers, and developing programs for beginning teachers would simply be an extension of the role already played by the state. Again we emphasize the actual development and conduct of the program could be carried on in the colleges and universities or through staff development units of local school districts or even through programs developed by teacher organizations, a common idea which has been suggested but not implemented.

It is impossible to estimate how much programs for beginning teachers might cost except to go by the current experience of Georgia, which is spending approximately 2.6 million dollars a year to maintain seventeen Regional Assessment Centers. This program includes an extensive program of evaluation as well as training and is focused on a broad range of competencies, not just the problems which teachers experience initially. It may be possible to mount a somewhat cheaper program if the purposes are more limited in scope, but it may also be that what Georgia attempts to do with its teachers is what beginning teachers need. It may be that if the system is not linked to evaluation and credentialing, it might be somewhat cheaper, but these are all considerations that need to be explored through pilot programs and a study of the problems of beginning teachers.

Conclusion

It seems clear to us that any new programs of the scale which we believe is necessary from our present study will require fiscal resources beyond those now allocated to the training of teachers. The state has both the taxing power to raise funds and the social power to redistribute funds to create such programs. We do not have adequate cost data to make specific suggestions on how this might be done, and any such analysis would have to estimate costs based on prototypes or models of different kinds of programs. We will recommend this kind of study as a way of beginning to estimate the magnitude of the fiscal problem and the ways in which the fiscal problem might be met.

It is obvious from our line of reasoning in this section that we think that the issue of fiscal responsibility may perhaps best be solved by allocation of this responsibility to the state. But this choice depends upon accepting the need for a comprehensive program for all beginning teachers. If the problem is of relatively less magnitude than we now suspect, a fact which might be revealed by future research, or if it is decided that only limited approaches to these problems need be made (although we find it difficult to see on what basis such a decision could be made), then the arguments for state involvement in responsibility for the fiscal resources are attenuated.

There is, of course, always a possibility that the state can simply impose solutions and require institutions to pick up the cost. This practice was followed in New York State in the development of competency-based programs, but in that case the responsibility for the design of the programs had already been allocated, and the state was simply requiring changes in design. Colleges and universities argued vigorously that they needed additional resources, largely to no avail. The state did support pilot programs with modest sums of money which were used to test out some of the principles and ideas that were to be applied subsequently in the competency-based programs. But the colleges had to bear the costs of revising their programs.

We do not see how this solution can be used in the development of the programs for beginning teachers unless such programs are simply minor extensions or modifications of existing current programs or of inservice programs. The recommendations of the Newman Commission are of such a character that at the present time it is not foreseen that the state will have to make a particular investment in the new program, but neither is the new program targeted to solving the problems of beginning teachers specifically. That may be a consequence of the new program, but one would not predict now that that would be an inevitable consequence.

POLICY ISSUES RELATED TO THE FEDERAL ROLE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROGRAMS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS

Obviously the Federal Government through the National Institute for Education or the Office of Education could establish a number of different kinds of programs or could fund a number of different kinds of programs for beginning teachers. Clearly the role of the National Institute of Education could be to develop the research program and support it, which is needed to understand more thoroughly and more comprehensively the problems of beginning teachers and the effectiveness of various remedies for these problems. Either the National Institute of Education or the

Office of Education could fund pilot programs through the states, through local school districts or through teacher training institutions.

There is considerable historical experience with this type of approach and the policy issues affecting the decision to move in these directions depend upon such considerations as availability of resources and competing goals and program activities.

The case for giving high priority to a program of research and development on beginning teachers programs is based on the following facts and reasoning:

1. The effectiveness of any teacher is largely influenced by his or her ability to master the transition period into teaching. Although this point has not been unequivocally demonstrated by empirical study, it seems likely that it would be.
2. Since the available knowledge on the problems of beginning teachers and how it affects their effectiveness is extremely limited, there is a clear need for a comprehensive research program on these problems and this relationship. Something more than the periodic dissertation on the problems of beginning teachers is essential if we are to understand how training affects the occurrence of these problems or the resolution of them. The evaluation of various types of programs is extremely limited, for all practical purposes non-existent, and one reason probably is the lack of support for such activities.
3. Professional development of the experienced teacher may be seriously impeded by the experiences of the transition or induction period. We have argued earlier and will expand on

> this point of view in later chapters that the beginning teacher learns to survive in the transition period, and how he or she learns to survive determines the kind of teaching style which the teacher adopts, and which they ordinarily do not change.

Any efforts to understand this situation require extensive research and the goals of this research are consistent with the general functions of the National Institute of Education in developing and funding research on teaching and learning. The National Institute could very well play a role comparable to that of the Department of Education and Science in Great Britain which funded the pilot schemes for teacher induction and their national evaluation.

Another category of studies are the policy studies which could be conducted and will be necessary if internships or beginning teacher assistance schemes are to be widely used and are to become an integral part of the structure of teacher education in the United States. There are many questions which need to be answered before such a development can take place. The more obvious ones are: 1) The effect of an internship or an induction scheme on the period provided for tenure; 2) the relation of local school district needs to a system for helping beginning teachers; 3) the costs of various arrangements and the source of funds for bearing these costs; 4) the resources available to be used in developing assistance programs for beginning teachers; 5) the relation of internships or assistance programs to the certification process These obviously are only samples, and most of the questions are generated by what would be the primary goal of innovations in programs for beginning teachers, and that is the creation of a new formal structure of teacher education.

Such a structure would have a continuous program up to the time at which a teacher is tenured, whichever scheme is developed or selected. A change of this magnitude requires changes in the structure of preservice and inservice training, and policy studies could be designed to anticipate what such changes might be, their feasibility and relative costs.

Research Problems

We have suggested that certain categories of research problems be investigated. The first of these is the precise nature of the kinds of problems which beginning teachers have and why they have them. At least three kinds of categories of variables ought to be studied in these research programs. The first of these are variables which identify the specific kinds of training which the beginning teacher has had. The second kind are the contexts in which the beginning teacher is working. The third category relates to certain personal characteristics of the beginning teachers, such as his or her skills in managing crises, solving problems, coping with stress, and being able to work with a minimal amount of support.

We know, for example, that all beginning teachers have had some form of practice teaching prior to the experience of the first year of full-time teaching. The variation in the amount of this practice teaching is not great, and since arrangements must be worked out by each school or department of education, we have little information on the variation in these sites. Are there any features of this practice teaching which are correlated with the kinds of problems which teachers have or with the absence of problems or with the degree to which the problems are experienced?

Some problems may be purely a function of the context in which the beginning teacher embarks on his or her teaching career. Others may occur across contexts. We have no idea at the present time of the extent to which certain kinds of problems are determined by the context in which the beginning teacher teaches.

A third set of characteristics describes or points to those aspects of personal development which predict survival of crises. Teachers or interns who have more skills for coping with anxiety, who may be more secure, whose self-esteem is less easily threatened may be less vulnerable to certain kinds of problems.

What is needed by way of research is a fairly precise description of the nature of the problems and the factors which affect their occurrence. Neither has been described well in the literature, especially the second factor. Research of this kind is necessarily descriptive at one level and analytic at another level. It is a necessary prelude to developing experimental programs and would be the source of basic facts about the nature of the problem.

An important aspect of this description of the problems of beginning teachers is the extent to which the difficulties are experienced by teachers and the severity of the different kinds of problems. Is it true, for example, that most beginning teachers have problems in "discipline" or management. This belief appears to be widely held, but one also hears about programs which spend considerable time working with trainees on management problems and whose directors think that they have eased the transition into teaching by giving their trainees the basic skills of managing a class.

We think two kinds of methodologies are needed here, one the kind of descriptive-correlational study which will provide some basic information on potential relationships among variables and an in-depth, intensive study of selected individuals or cohorts of individuals moving through the training experience and the first years of teaching. A sample of trainees might very well be identified at the beginning of their training program and followed from then through the first year of teaching. Another sample of beginning teachers might be identified and followed through three successive years a sample of beginning teachers. This type of design would present the opportunity for replication of the data. Thus a study could be begun in year one in which a sample of teachers starting to teach are studied in depth, and another sample of trainees is identified at the beginning of their training programs. By the third year when the sample of trainees is entering teaching there would then be two years of data on beginning teachers. The combination of tracing the course of development by following teachers from their first year of teaching through two successive years would give a fairly complete sample of the various stages of development of the teacher. Such a study ought to be conducted in a number of different places and in programs of somewhat different types so that the effects of variations by locale or by program design can be at least crudely estimated.

The first kind of study provides breadth and the opportunity to estimate the parameters of the causes of the problems or the correlates of the problems. The second type of study enables the investigator to trace in great detail the development of a problem and relate it to other crises or problem which the individual may have experienced prior to that. To insure links between the data sets some individuals can be included in both samples.

Another type of study which could be done is to interview experienced teachers more systematically than they have been on the kinds of experiences they have had from the first year of teaching and how those experiences affected their subsequent teaching. Such a study is a secondary approach to discovering the long-term effects of the first year of experience on subsequent teaching skills but most teachers can speak at length on such matters and the information which they provide may be revealing about the effects of the first year of teaching on them. We are aware that studies that depend on recollections have limitations, but the experiences of the first year are sufficiently vivid apparently in the minds of most teachers that it is likely, but unprovable that the teachers would be giving fairly accurate descriptions of what had happened to them and how they were influenced by what happened.

These studies would be designed to supplement and improve the quality of the information which we have on the nature of problems of beginning teachers. But they would be organized in such a way that the factors influencing the origins of these problems might be detected. Such information is essential if we are to decide what kinds of programs to set up for beginning teachers.

The Evaluation of Existing Programs

In our judgment the most that should be done in the immediate future is to gather some kinds of evaluative data on a limited number of programs. There are obviously two schemes of internships which can be compared, even though one could not assign students randomly to the two programs. The University of Oregon presents a model of the extended program in which the internship is built on preservice training. This program could be compared to another program in which the internship is conducted only after the undergraduate period and with no prior preservice training.

The problem with doing comparative evaluations of existing programs is that there are so many factors which make the programs incomparable. They exist in different types of institutions from state universities to private institutions, both large and small. They are located in widely different places and their interns teach in different kinds of schools and school systems. We question, therefore, how much such studies can be used to make reasonably sound and definitive judgments about program design. These considerations are particularly important because there is no way we can randomly assign (without a national program of admissions and support) trainees to different kinds of programs. At best one will be able to make modest judgments about comparative effects by equating as many characteristics of individuals as it is possible to equate.

To mount any more comprehensive evaluations would require the development of programs that can be compared. We are not advocating here absolutely strict experimental design as a necessity before any kinds of judgments could be made. But it is difficult to draw the kinds of conclusions which are needed in the present state of arrangements of programs. Programs are generally similar if one reviews their major characteristics, but any close inspection could reveal substantial differences. Some effort would be needed to "systematize the interventions" so that we have interventions which in the first place we can describe in some detail and secondly, because we can describe them sufficiently well, we are able to compare one type of intervention to another. Such experimental evaluations probably cannot be done without some program development.

Program Development

Assuming that arrangements can be made within the policies of either the National Institute of Education or the Office of Education, a system of planned variations in programs could be developed. We are fully aware that this is not the period of funding of projects of great scope, but working from existing programs it might be possible to shape some of these programs into designs so that reasonable comparisons can be made among them. Also it would be possible to create some alternatives which do not now exist; for example, it might be possible to set up a program using teacher centers to conduct programs for beginning teachers.

The problem is not to demonstrate that certain kinds of programs work. We believe that on the basis of experience the internship has demonstrated its success. We think that assistance programs for teachers if carefully designed would have no trouble demonstrating their utility. Even the traditional preservice program has sufficient successes that it should be taken seriously as a training format. The problem is we do not know what in each of these programs makes them successful and whether or not one is uniformly better than another.

A number of institutions around the country do conduct more than one type of program. These are the ideal places in which to do some sound comparative evaluation. We recommend, therefore, that this possibility be explored and hopefully used for the creation of some systematic development of particular ways of training and assisting teachers that can be compared. As we have suggested above any such system ought to be conducted over the life of the training program plus the year of induction into teaching.

These policy considerations lead to an analysis of the kinds of research and evaluation which are needed to settle or inform policy issues and to develop programs.

Chapter 9

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

This chapter describes the kinds of research which are needed to define more precisely the nature of the problems of beginning teachers, to understand their causes, and to place this phase of the teachers' development in the context of the teachers' total development as professionals. It also describes how procedures, or methods, or programs for assisting the beginning teacher, either through preservice training or through on-the-job assistance programs, may be evaluated. The chapter sketches an outline of the major directions of a research and evaluation program designed to achieve these goals.

This chapter also describes policy studies which prepare policy makers with information to help them make decisions about the kinds of programs which ought to be developed and mounted to assist beginning teachers.

RESEARCH ON THE PROBLEMS OF BEGINNING TEACHERS

There is one obvious line of research which is needed immediately. We have described at many points in this volume the facts about our present state of knowledge concerning the problems of beginning teachers, their causes and remedies. The general conclusion from these facts is that we know very little. The obvious first step, therefore, is to develop a program designed to improve this knowledge in three important respects.

First, we ought to know more precisely what the defining characteristics of the problems of beginning teachers are. As important as it is to know that beginning teachers suffer fear, anxiety and trauma, it is even more important to know the precise nature of those fears, anxieties and trauma. It is useful to know that beginning teachers have problems in managing classes, an almost universally accepted fact. But we know practically nothing about the precise nature of these problems. Some appear to arise from an inability to assert oneself. Others may be failures to institute certain practices which appear to work very well for experienced teachers; for example, many experienced elementary school teachers will recommend that whatever the method used, the teacher quickly establish the ground rules for behavior in the class--who will be responsible for certain tasks, how materials may be retrieved, where materials and equipment may be placed. It is not essential at this point to know whether or not these practices are the "true causes" of good management. Our question here is, are beginning teachers using generally accepted and obviously reasonable practices of management?

When beginning teachers have problems in managing classes, is it related to the way they teach the students? Or do they not understand that they may be violating certain expected ways for teachers to act with respect to students? Have they established sufficient distance between themselves and students; or have they established too much distance? In what ways are defective relations with pupils created?

For each of these questions different persons will have different views of their relative significance; that is, some people will believe that the answers to such questions are critical for understanding why beginning teachers get into difficulties and others will emphasize other questions. The issue here, however, is not which of the behaviors or procedures implied or stated in these questions is the practice or among the practices which are most likely to be effective in management of classes. The problem in trying to define the difficulties of beginning teachers is to know what, in fact, they do and do not do, which may conceivably lead them into genuine problems of some magnitude in the management of their classes. At present all we know is that they have problems in managing. What these problems are, and what they are doing or not doing about these problems, has not been described in any kind of detail or with any kind of precision. Because we do not know these facts, we have no way of tracing the origins easily. We do not know, for example, if they have been taught some of these practices and are not using them or did not have sufficient opportunity to practice them and thereby acquire ease and comfort and skill in using them.

We may start with any major area of difficulty, such as classroom management, instructional planning, grading, organization of specific lessons, and all the other areas where we have noted that the beginning teacher has difficulties and may have very large problems. All we can say about these areas at the present time is that they appear to be where beginning teachers have difficulties and problems. But we could not sit down and write out a description of the difficulties. We could not describe how beginning teachers manage the first day of instruction, nor what kinds of planning they do or do not do, nor how they go about setting up grading practices or communicating these grading practices to their students. The consequences of this lack of information are that we do not have good categorical descriptions of the problems. A label like "management problems" covers a very large variety of possibilities, as do most of the other categorical descriptions of the problems of beginning teachers. We do not know if these problems, therefore, are different in kind from the problems that any teacher might have on any given day or at any given time in his or her work with pupils. It may be that the management problems which beginning teachers have are the management problems which every teacher might experience on a recurrent basis. "Relations with pupils" is an obvious example of this possibility. The beginner may have precisely the same difficulties in relating to pupils that an experienced teacher has after ten or fifteen years of teaching. The difficulty may be inherent in the nature of the relationship of teacher to student--the teacher exercises a certain amount of influence and power or authority over the student which the student systematically resists; or the teacher and pupil may have different values because the teacher is trying to lead the pupil from one set of values to another. Such difficulties may inevitably occur in the nature of the processes of teaching.

Other problems may be unique to the beginning teacher because they have not been trained adequately or because learning to cope with the problem evolves as one has more experience with it. Pacing a lesson is probably a problem in this category. A teacher has to get the "feel" of the time span of a lesson or a period of instruction and has to develop a sense of how time is moving, how long it takes to conduct certain activities, when to make changes in the pace of the instructional activity, and how to be sensitive to passage of time. Most teachers learn how this movement of instructional time proceeds by experience. In contrast, beginners frequently prepare far too much material than can be covered within a specified period of time. This particular aspect of managing classes can be learned by simulated practice in micro-teaching. For example, trainees can practice giving portions of lessons, and the amount of instructional material that they attempt to cover in these periods will either fit or not fit; the reason it does not fit within that time span will be usually apparent. By successive practice in organizing the time spans of a variety of activities, the trainee can learn about how much can actually be presented in any given period of time, depending upon the nature of the instructional activity. But using this kind of learning in the context of a full lesson and a day of lessons, day after day, is something that is learned by experience as the teacher covers larger and larger amounts of instructional content or instructs a variety of activities over time.

Making the description of the problems and difficulties of beginning teachers more precise is a necessary base for moving to a fuller understanding of how and why these problems occur and what can be done to ameliorate them, to alleviate them, or to prevent their occurrence. The example given immediately above is an instance of using an instructional system to ameliorate or alleviate a problem. Trainees who have no experience in timing units of instruction or instructional activities come to the first day of class with no sense of how long any given activity in which they may engage the class is likely to last. If they are a high school teacher, for example, they may well organize far more material than they can reasonably cover in a period; or contrarily, so little that they are left a large amount of unplanned time. If they are elementary teachers, they may have no sense of how long it takes children to carry out the particular instructional activity, and, therefore, may not allow enough time for the completion of a task. If we know the precise nature of the difficulty, we are more likely to be able to identify its cause, and increase the possibility that we can come up with a solution that will help the teacher.

Problems with Existing Data

The existing surveys of the problems of beginning teachers suffer from many of the most common faults of poorly conducted surveys. The categories are ill-defined, or are so broad that it is difficult to classify problems or difficulties into them. These impressions in concept and description inevitably must create difficulties for the respondent who will impose their own understanding of the meaning of words on the categories to which they are asked to respond, when the methodology of checking categories of problems is used. To beginning teachers or to teachers reflecting on their past who say they have management problems, we do not know if they are talking about the same category of problems. One may be referring to the difficulties of organizing instruction in groups and the other to keeping pupils on-task or arousing their interest in the instructional activity. We know from the available literature that there are groups of problems with poorly defined boundaries which beginning teachers seem to have. There is little doubt that most beginning teachers refer to a collection of activities as problems to which they apply such labels as management problems, discipline problems, organizing instruction problems, and the like. What we do not know is whether these are equivalent problems and whether each person that uses such a label is referring to the same set of events.

It should be obvious that any progress in understanding the problems of beginning teachers or working out ways of solving these problems depends directly on the quality of information we have about them. Perhaps some of our difficulties in generating adequate solutions may be traced directly to the lack of information which we have about these problems.

Suppose that we say that all or most beginning teachers have some kinds of management problems. That is a reasonable statement, and it is also reasonable to suggest that they be trained in how to cope with or solve these management problems. But the next step is the critical one. What kinds of training will we give them? Shall we train them in reinforcement techniques so that they learn to reward desirable behaviors of pupils? Shall we attempt to develop their understanding of the meanings of different kinds of pupil behavior so that they do not overreact or so that they do not choose an inappropriate or irrelevant method of working with pupils with whom they may be having difficulty? Do we teach them a series of routines which are likely to give them better control over the activities of the class?

Most training in these respects tends to have a shotgun character, whether it be given in preservice programs or inservice programs. Some of its ineffectiveness may be directly attributed to its irrelevance to the precise nature of the problem which the teachers are having.

It is difficult to see how any sensible judgment can be made about what to do about the problems of beginning teachers without more precise descriptions of what these problems are. But that is only one of our difficulties in understanding these problems and developing solutions to them.

Severity of the Problems of Beginning Teachers

We know that the period of induction into teaching, the transition from the preservice program to "real" teaching, is a particularly perilous and traumatic period in the life of the teacher. We know that some teachers never survive this period; they do not master it, and within a relatively short period of time they leave teaching. We know that others are so traumatized by this period that the range of their effectiveness is severely constricted. We know that there are other severe psychological problems which result from the experience of beginning teaching. We also know, in a more positive vein, that many teachers have initial difficulties but master them and go on to be competent and reasonably successful teachers.

We do not know anything about the severity of different kinds of problems. We could not say with even the remotest approximation of precision or definition how severe the management problems of the beginning teachers are. Given any group of 100 beginning teachers, do they all have management problems? Do they all have the same management problems? Do they all have the same management problems to the same degree? We do not know. Do all beginning teachers have problems in pacing lessons? In planning instruction over periods of time? In communicating the results of their evaluations to pupils or to the parents?

We have an impression that the general belief is that there are certain kinds of problems which are common to almost all, if not all, beginning teachers'. We have the impression that there are other kinds of problems whose occurrence seems to depend on the characteristics or abilities of individual teachers--some seem to be more organized from the first day than are others.

Some teachers apparently move through the transition rather smoothly and efficiently. We do not know how many of these there are, and the lack of information in this respect may lead us to exaggerate the severity of the problems of beginning teachers.

That is the difficulty in making judgments in this area. Since we have no notion of the severity of problems, either by category, or by numbers of teachers, or by length of their duration, we may exaggerate the difficulties of this period. Certainly judgment of the relative importance of different kinds of problems is severely impaired. We have no notion of which problems to attack first.

If one studies the literature and listens to teachers and teacher educators, one hears recurrent ideas or themes. Almost everyone seems to agree that management is the basic problem, and one has the impression that it is almost universal. How valid this perception is is unknown, but because it is widely accepted, it is commonly agreed that somebody, preferably the teacher educators in the pre-service program, ought to "do something" about preparing teachers for the management problems which they will inevitably have.

This may be precisely the most innappropriate solution because we know so little about the nature of the problems. It may not be a training problem; it may be a problem in attitudes, or values, or expectations, and skill training may have little to do with the resolution of the problem in such cases. Or it may be a mixture of attitudinal problems and skill problems which will appear in varying degrees in individual teachers. Some may have appropriate attitudes and expectations and need to learn a particular skill. Others may need modifications in their attitudes and expectations, but may have some relevant skills which they can transfer to this particular situation.

Certainly those teachers who ultimately fail or who leave teaching or who remain in teaching with impaired effectiveness have had severe problems. We ought to be able to identify how severe those problems were and to link the degree of severity to the consequences. Were these teachers who left teaching individuals whose management problems were extreme? Most of us would almost immediately say "Yes" to that question but, as a matter of fact, we do not know that is the reason for such failures. We do not know how severe the management problem has to be before it is likely to produce failure in the career of teaching.

Running through the above paragraphs are really two dimensions of the scope or range of problems beginning teachers have. One dimension is the dimension of severity, the other is the dimension of the extent of the problem across teachers. The two dimensions can be kept separate analytically, even though in talking about the problems of beginning teachers it is much too easy to intermingle the dimensions or confound them. In the above section, for example, in talking about the severity of problems, we also pointed to their extent by asking such questions as "Does everyone have severe management problems?" or "Is the management problem one of the most serious problems the beginning teacher faces?".

It should be possible to do research which results at least in a two-by-two matrix of problems, one dimension of which is the extent of the problem, the other the severity. Extent is a problem in frequency; severity is a problem which has to be defined in terms of consequences. Obviously the most severe problems are those which are highly likely to lead to failure or to severe impairment of efficiency and effectiveness. Or severe problems are those which have spreading effects. Some forms of management or discipline problems create other problems which, in turn, create still other problems, so that the core problem is like a cancer which spreads all through the teaching of a particular teacher.

Extent of the Problems

The extent problem defines the frequency with which the problem occurs. Some of these problems may be almost universal across beginning teachers. Certainly the evidence suggests that such is the case, because the studies in the United States, Great Britain, and Australia are remarkably similar in their results. So we strongly suspect that there is a subcategory of problems which are inherent in the nature of induction into teaching.

Other problems may be dependent on such other factors as the context in which the person is teaching: that is, some problems will occur in certain situations but not in others. Some obvious examples are teachers who are teaching children who have severe performance deficits in reading. The instructional problem in such a situation is, particularly when the problem characterizes a whole group of children in a school, that it creates special instructional problems which, in turn, for a beginning teacher, may create a particular category of difficulty. Or it may be that problems this teacher would have in any case are exacerbated by the context in which they are occurring. We ought to be able to separate those problems which are context bound from those which are either alleviated or exacerbated by the context.

DESCRIPTIVE METHODOLOGY

We have been describing the need for more precise definitions of the problems of beginning teachers and descriptions of their severity and extent. The relative research methodologies for gathering such information are those which are characteristically used in descriptive surveys. But we wish to offer some recommendations about how to proceed in conducting these surveys or gathering the data for these descriptions.

First a few words on the limitations of the available research literature. The sampling procedures used in these studies are poor in one major respect; they are very limited samples in terms of the extent to which generalizations can be made from them. In many studies the sample of beginning teachers studied are the graduates of a particular institution. These samples, we know, are not representative of all beginning teachers. If, for example, the beginning teachers studied are the graduates of the University of Oregon or the University of Kentucky, what do these two samples have in common? Both institutions are major state universities, but they may have different selection procedures; we know they have different training programs. The kinds of candidates who go into teaching in these two states may be drawn from different populations within the state.

As we look at different kinds of samples that have been constructed in any one study, we are probably tapping one kind of subgroup within the general population of beginning teachers, which until recently was a fairly stable population. It was possible to describe each cohort of beginning teachers in the same ways year after year because the population from which they were drawn and the methods used to select them did not change substantially. Each cohort of beginning teachers across the country was remarkably similar.

It is for that reason we can generalize across studies. We have already pointed out that the results of the studies, irrespective of the methodology used, are remarkably similar, so we have some confidence in results as they have been developed. But we do not have carefully constructed samples in which comparisons can be made within the sample of teachers studied. The generalizability of the results which we have suggested may be based more on the imprecision of the categories used than it is on the fact that teachers in various places are giving essentially the same answers to the questions about their problems as beginning teachers.

For similar reasons it is difficult to draw conclusions about the affect of context on the kinds of problems beginning teachers have. The literature suggests, much to the surprise of many of its readers, that beginning teachers in inner-city schools have the same kinds of problems but have them to a greater degree than their colleagues in other schools.

In analyzing these descriptive results, we have a problem that has two aspects to it. One, the samples are samples of convenience, and therefore we have difficulty generalizing from any one sample to a larger sample or to the population of beginning teachers; two, the nature of the questions asked is not similar from survey to survey, and even where common labels or categories of questions are used, we do not know whether these categories have the same meaning from survey to survey.

Obviously both problems have to be resolved. Of the two problems, the sampling problem can be solved in the most straightforward and direct manner. It would be possible to construct comparable surveys across a sample of beginning teachers on a national basis, which would give us some idea of the range and extent of problems, two points about which we have no reliable information at the present time. We do not propose here how to design that particular study or series of studies, but the sampling design presents no special difficulties. The real difficulties in conducting such a survey are the fiscal costs, obtaining the cooperation of beginning teachers in a variety of places, the management of such a survey, and the precision with which the substance of the survey is defined.

We do think that some form of studies of this kind are probably necessary to answer two kinds of questions, one about the extent of the problems, the other about the context of the problems. We do not think that thousands of teachers have to be surveyed; in any case, at the present time the number of beginning teachers is relatively small and, therefore, this may be a good time to conduct such surveys, since a more reliable estimate of the population variables can be made by surveying a relatively small number of beginning teachers. There is clearly a policy decision that needs to be made before such a survey is conducted, and that is how much information we need about the extent and the context of these problems in order to justify embarking upon a program which will, hopefully, eventually lead to their solution.

It must be admitted that on the basis of the literature now available one might very well make some judgments without further information. The real issue, however, is the quality of the information as much as it is, if not more, than its extensiveness. We propose, therefore, another descriptive type of study which, in our judgment, ought to be done in any case and ought to be done first, before any attempt is made to survey the breadth and scope of the problems which are identified.

Intensive Study of a Limited Sample of Beginning Teachers

One way to sharpen the definition of the problems of beginning teachers is to select a sample of beginning teachers who can be followed through the first year or two of teaching (the length of time they are followed depends on the variety of purposes to be served by the study). Consider the case of studying a sample of such teachers through the first year of teaching.

The essence of the methodology is to follow these individuals at least from the time that they have been selected for a position in a particular school system. (We will discuss in another section in this chapter more comprehensive developmental studies of teachers.) These teachers ought to be followed from this point to the end of the first year or a period of one month after completion of the first full year of teaching.

By following we mean: observing in their classes, talking with them, talking with people who are also observing them or who know them well. The purpose of such a study would be to describe what happens to this teacher as he or she begins the process of getting ready to teach, actually begins teaching, and carries out the duties of teaching through the first year. In such a study, we would expect the investigator to be talking regularly with the beginning teacher. How does he or she feel about the processes of selection? How did the beginner choose the districts to which he or she applied? Was the teacher selected for the district in which he wanted to teach? How did he or she feel about the assignment to the school? How well prepared does each of them feel for the particular teaching assignment which they were given? These are samples of questions which would be asked on a regular basis at each phase of that teacher's life during the first year of teaching. These questions should focus on perceptions and feelings and cognitions, and should explore the kinds of attitudes and values which regularly are used to evaluate the situations in which the teacher is a participant. We would want to know how these teachers think about themselves, about the situation in which they are, how they feel about what they are doing, what their goals are, what values and attitudes determine their judgments or their actions, what kinds of feedback on their own performances or feelings they are receiving. We would want to know what actions they engage in: how they plan; how they organize materials; how they organize for instruction; how they gather materials, internal or external, they typically use; whom they consult; how they evaluate advice which they are given; to whom they talk about their instructional problems or personal problems in teaching.

This information about teachers may be collected in a variety of ways such as short questionnaires at intervals, attitude scales to respond to, diaries to complete. But we think the most important method to be used is to talk to the teacher frequently, particularly about experiences in which the investigator has seen the teacher participate. The importance of a close relation between the teacher and the investigator of the kind that yields detailed and in-depth information is obvious.

The other important investigative activity is observing the teacher in every situation that is new for the teacher and where adaptation and coping and problem-solving are critical if the teacher is to move in a progressive way through the first year. The combination of observations and interviews provides the essential information for understanding what problems are occurring and will provide some data on why they occur.

To conduct such a study means that many fewer teachers will be observed than in a more comprehensive survey-type of study. The importance of the study recommended here is that it can be used to define precisely the kinds of problems teachers are having.

Variations on the Intensive Descriptive Methodology

This methodology can be varied in several different ways, preferably in a series of interrelated and interconnected studies. We earlier referred to the possibility of extending the study in time over a year or two beyond the first year of teaching. Teachers can be followed into their second or even their third year of teaching without the intensive data collection of the first year to estimate the kinds of effects which are longer lasting in character.

Obviously an important question is the long-term effect of the first year's experience. An investigation should be set up to determine what the second year of teaching is like after the first year. This goal might be achieved by selecting from the first year samples a subsample of teachers, each of whom has had different kinds of problems or problems with different degrees of severity. One would want, for example, a subsample of teachers which included those who had severe management problems and those who did not. Other dimensions could be selected.

Ideally, such a follow-up study should be conducted with a cohort after we have learned what the basic problems are, how to define them precisely, and what their critical or essential features are. This study might very well be a second-stage study, and the arguments for conducting it as a second-stage study are persuasive. Some may think that some economy can be achieved by continuing the study into the second or third year, and we will not disagree with that recommendation, but we warn here again of the difficulties that are created in these studies by lack of precise information about the nature of the problems. A follow-up study is bound to be contaminated by poor descriptions of the original problems. On the assumption that the investigators would need some time to organize and analyze their data, the best that may be achieved with the original cohorts is a second-year study, the purpose of which is to define more precisely what second-year or third-year effects might be. But a more precise study would inevitably have to be made after greater precision in the definition of the original problem had been achieved.

Most of these problems are resolvable problems of planning and economy and efficiency. The critical idea in this analysis is the focus of attention on obtaining precise information in a variety of ways about the problems of beginning teachers. Once this goal has been accomplished, at least in part, it is then possible to use other methodologies to follow teachers two or three years after the initial year, to study the extent of any one of these problems across a variety of teachers, to study the relative severity of different kinds of problems across a group of teachers.

STRATEGY FOR DESCRIPTIVE STUDIES

We recommend, therefore, intensive study of the problems of beginning teachers in order to define them more precisely as the initial phase of study. We do not see how much can be accomplished in this area of research and practice without that first step. We then suggest that a second stage be conducted in which surveys are made of the extent and severity of the problems with a larger and more representative sample of beginning teachers.

Again, there are variations on the basic design which can be developed. Choices among these variations depend upon policy decisions about relative cost, and the significance of more precise information.

Our position is that we do not need more precise information in order to begin working on the solution to the problems of beginning teachers. We think that one can obtain more precise information and, at the same time, begin some work on resolving the problems of beginning teachers or that, in fact, the two kinds of research can be integrated.

We are concerned that the precise description of these problems will be slighted. There are two reasons to be anxious in this respect. One is that historically that has been our habit. We have not done this work in a period of 75 years of research activity in education. The other reason is more compelling, and that is that practitioners and the representatives already have strong convictions about what the problems are and what their cures may be.

It is not necessary to denigrate the views of experienced teachers or their representatives to make a solid point which all parties ought to attend to. The information that one picks up from teachers and their representatives probably has validity in the same sense that the kinds of information that is produced in the variety of studies in the research literature has validity. But, it also suffers from lack of definition and precision, and the consequence of this lack of precision can only lead to imprecise remedies. One need only look around to the inservice programs and courses, even those recognized by teachers in teacher centers, to find that the solutions are of the same shotgun character as those proposed by teacher educators. We know of only a few places, where individual work with beginning teachers occurred as part of a larger program. This individual work seems to have been more effective than other approaches to solving the problems of beginning teachers. This approach is like the kinds of programs which have been established in Great Britain, and probably works for much the same reasons that some of those programs work. We think the use of this admittedly effective approach can be traced directly to the lack of precision about the nature of the problems. Therefore, we are concerned that recommendations to study these problems in great depth may be shunted aside in the interests of "doing something" because of the widespread recognition of the severity of the problems of the transition period and the widespread recognition of the utility of the solution.

Our judgment about the value of more comprehensive surveys once these basic, in-depth studies have been conducted is that much more flexible. Some type of survey studies of the extent and severity of these problems probably should be conducted simply to inform policy makers on the range of the problem. Policy makers need this kind of information to support the programs they will develop. Or these studies are needed to call the attention of policy makers to the problem. But it is doubtful if we need a national survey like the surveys that are conducted of graduating classes of high school students. We need enough information to suggest to policy makers that the problem of the beginning teacher is the critical problem in the education of teachers. Such surveys might be more profitably conducted in terms of the potentialities for inspiring action through a series of state-by-state surveys where policy makers are more ready to move on the basis of the information which would be introduced.

We will return to this aspect of strategy at a later point in this chapter when we discuss policy studies.

IDENTIFYING THE CAUSES OF THE PROBLEMS OF BEGINNING TEACHERS

As important as the description of these problems of beginning teachers are such descriptions are, at best. only a first step. Equally if not more important, is identifying the causes of the problems, because without such identification it is very unlikely that we can develop training solutions.

Ideally, the initial efforts to identify causes should be a part of the in-depth study of the problems of beginning teachers. The point being made here is a point about the distinction between ideas and hypotheses which can be generated in an exploratory way as a study is being conducted whose main purpose something else, and a careful analysis of causes once one has identified the types of problems of which causes ought to be sought. It would wasteful in two ways to impose too much of a research burden on the in-depth studies. Since the problems are not sufficiently defined before this study is begun, and since, in fact, the purpose of the study is to define more precisely those problems, we cannot create a strategy for seeking causes because we do not know what problems we are going to seek the causes of. or the priority in which we ought to do this seeking. If the management problem is the most critical problem of beginning teachers, then we ought to look for its causes as a first priority; but until we know that in fact it is a severe problem, that it is one that is had by all beginning teachers or most, and until we know what we mean by that kind of problem, it is a waste of time to do an intensive or extensive causal analysis. But, we can stimulate investigators and require of them that they look for information which might be used to interpret causal relations and to expect of them that they would offer hypotheses about potential causal relations.

With that kind of constraint on what can be or should be expected of the in-depth studies, we propose, therefore, a second major kind of study, the purpose of which will be to identify in a systematic way the causes of the major and most severe problems of beginning teachers. The first step is a choice of which problems need this kind of study.

There are advantages to restricting the scope of the study. First, we are more likely to do a thorough causal analysis if we choose fewer problems. Second, we can move to another phase of the study, which will be described shortly, namely, an experimental phase in developing programs for the solution of the problems. Third, what we learn about causes for the most severe problems may well generalize to other kinds of problems. There may be factors in the development of teachers, in their origins, in their personality characteristics, in their experiential background, in certain characteristics of training programs which are the sources of most if not all problems.

We would also have reduced the scope or range of problems by systematic analysis of them. At the present time, categories of problems are inventions of some investigator's mind. We know nothing about the empirical relations among these problems. Most of the research literature reports only frequency counts. We have very few correlational studies which reveal the correlations among various categories of problems. As a consequence we know very little about the structure of problems which have been studied. It may turn out that a careful analysis using the quantitative methods which are available and well-known would substantially reduce the number of problems whose causes have to be studied. If this can be done, then our causal analysis will have great power and efficiency. Therefore, we recommend that this careful analysis of the data on the problems be performed to reduce their number through quantitative methods or other forms of analysis so that the most severe among them be selected for the first set of studies, and the causal analysis then proceed with respect to these problems. Since we are about to propose two different strategies of causal analysis, either approach may be used so that a beginning may be made in moving in the direction of developing solutions through causal analysis.

An Experimental Strategy for Causal Analysis

We propose the following strategy as one approach to causal analysis. Actually it is the most effective method for precise and valid identification of causes of problems, but the most difficult to carry out. It requires imagination and a certain amount of cleverness in experimental design, but what we are proposing is well within the state of the art, though this strategy is rarely followed in education. Something like it is done but in a relatively unorganized manner when a program developer creates an inservice course or makes a modification in a preservice program. The development of the internship was an experimental intervention designed to solve the problems of the transition into teaching as well as other kinds of purposes.

What we are proposing here is a more precise attack. The difficulty with the approaches used in the past where someone proposes an overall strategy like the internship to solve the problems of beginning teachers is that the approach is too scattered--both across goals which it is suppose to achieve and methods which it uses. As a consequence its effectiveness is probably so severely limited that it is also impossible to tell what is working and to what purpose. The internship, for example, is more than teaching half or full-time in a school system. It is a complex of activities and events each of which contributes in varying degrees to the measured outcomes, but we do not know how to detect the relative influence of any aspect of the internship on particular developments or acquisitions of skill or achievement of competence in the beginning teacher.

The alternative that we are proposing would work something like this: begin with one kind of problem precisely defined, for example, an aspect of what is now called the management problem. We would have, through our in-depth studies, identified the components of what is now called the management problem. We then create deliberately two or three potential ways of eliminating that problem and develop a small scaled experiment in which we compare them.

Suppose, for example, that it has been found that most beginning teachers know very little about the establishment of routines which facilitate classroom management, and as a consequence they create problems of disorder among their pupils which in turn leads them to try to resolve this disorder in rather ineffective ways. We have concluded from out previous studies that with some training of some kind we could eliminate this problem before it occurs. Because we have defined the problem precisely, it is not difficult to think of different ways of ameliorating or preventing it. We have already made the major decision that we think it can be prevented so we design an experiment which includes one or two methods of training which ought to prevent the problem and one or two methods of helping with the problem if it occurs.

Anything we say from this point on presupposes a close working relationship between a training institution and a school system. We will say now and we will repeat it at various points that every methodology in this chapter depends upon a concerted attack of teacher educators and teachers and school systems on the problems which we have been describing. The study of the problems and testing methods of solutions depends upon cooperation between a training institution and a receiving school district.

A cohort in a given locale of trainees who will begin to teach in a given year will be assigned to one of the two major treatment strategies, prevention or assistance if the problems occurs. The prevention group will be given specific training on routines which ought to be established by each teacher and will be encouraged to use these routines, if possible, during the supervised practicum experience in which they will inevitably be engaged. If the training program is an internship, this program would be given in the period preceding the actual beginning of school. The other group would be followed very carefully as they begin to teach and as soon as a teacher is identified as having failed to establish routines and a management problem seems to be developing, this teacher will then be put into an amelioration or assistance strategy.

We need to make only a few points about what the prevention strategies or the assistance strategies might be. The prevention strategies might be variations on how to learn and practice and use different kinds of routines.

Some of this training could be simulation training, some of it could be supervised practicum experience, some of it could be demonstration through modeling, some of it could be cognitive analysis and description of relevant procedures. What we would suggest is that two methods likely to be effective are chosen. The goal is to find out whether there is a sufficiently powerful prevention strategy which would demonstrate that prevention could work. There may be no prevention strategy sufficiently powerful to preclude the problem. However, at this point it is necessary to pick what are most likely to be the one or two most powerful methods to see if there is any possibility of using a prevention strategy.

Similarly for the assistance methods, one would devise two or three methods of assistance which should be highly effective. An obvious one is individual personal instruction using such methods as conferences with the trainee on practices, demonstrating what could be done, giving feedback as the beginning teacher tries different approaches. Other methods could be variations on the individual personal instruction methods. For the purposes of this study, one potentially very good method could be used.

The goal of a design is to imbed in the preventive strategy and the assistance strategy the most likely effective method of helping a teacher if prevention can solve the problem or if assistance during the time of the problem is likely to be more beneficial. Many people may think that if we are trying to resolve a problem which most beginning teachers are likely to have, that a prevention strategy is obviously the best to use and therefore what we ought to be doing is comparing different kinds of prevention strategies. But it has long since been demonstrated that the receptivity of the trainee is a critical factor in how much their training helps them once they have actually begun to teach. It is also well known the trainee is a student at the time of training in a diffuse student environment where they are more or less involved in developing their skills as a teacher. They may very well hear what they are being told about as this problem, but the training does not register. The trainee simply may be more receptive to help when he or she has an actual need for that help. Or it may be that the skills are better learned and applied in the real context than in simulations of or approximations to it.

We are suggesting, therefore, quite straightforwardly that the first and critical question is whether prevention or assistance is necessary, and which of the two helps best with the solution of the problem. We have no contrasts of this kind in any of the literature. Individuals argue back and forth on both sides of the question of prevention versus assistance at the time. Usually the arguments revolve around the receptivity of the trainee and the value of having the problem imbedded in the context or not imbedded as a way of developing more realistic solutions. Most strategies at the present time are related to policy matters, the British experiments being the best example. The British have chosen to consider investing training resources on when the trainee is on the job rather than attempt to improve the quality of teacher education so that the problems do not occur in the first place. The bases of these choices are related to such matters as the amount of time available for training, the cost of training in the teacher education institution in contrast to the cost on the job, the reality and worthwhileness of the training procedures, and ultimately of what economists would call the marginal utility of either method. Since data are usually not available to make choices about marginal utility, policy makers make these decisions on other grounds, the British experiments being a case in point.

What we are proposing is that we study systematically by using a series of interconnected and interrelated experimental studies whether prevention or assistance, or some combination of them, is the most effective approach to resolving particular kinds of beginning teachers' problems. We suspect that these problems are sufficiently variable in nature that any one approach to solutions is not likely to work for all of them. Some problems probably can be prevented, some problems can be resolved only by assistance on the job, other problems will be ameliorated or attenuated or obviated by a combination of preventive strategies and assistance strategies. In the long run the methods of solution will be more economical if we can produce some basic information.

A research strategy of this kind could be elaborated needlessly. We are proposing as a basic strategy that a limited number of experiments be conducted in which prevention methods and assistance methods are systematically compared, that these experimental studies be conducted only with reference to what have previously been identified as the most critical problems of beginning teachers, and that we have sorted out those problems which might be amenable to training or education from those which are likely to be occurring because of the developmental stages of the beginning teachers as human beings. Given this basic work, these experimental studies proposed here then make sense. But it does not make sense to condut an enormous array of experimental studies out of which we hope to identify the best methods of solutions of problems.

As we have said, we expect a variety of kinds of solutions to emerge from this study and until we know which are the most effective for what kinds of problems, we see no sense in recommending overall strategies such as internships as ways of alleviating these problems, or induction schemes conducted in school districts, or inservice programs or programs conducted through teacher centers, and a host of other attractive and interesting ideas which suggest themselves.

We have also not gone into great detail on the methods within each of these overall strategies. There are a variety of procedures that can be easily thought of, and we have simply stated that the most critical principle to apply is to pick, in any given experiment, the particular method which holds the greatest promise for developing the desired skills or knowledge or attitudes which are likely to prevent or ameliorate a problem. The source of ideas for these strategies are existing theories and studies of teacher training. We suspect that such variables as those related to how individualized a treatment is, how comprehensible the behavior pattern to be learned is, how readily demonstrable the desired performance may be, and the availability of feedback on performance and opportunities for practice are the critical sources of variables which determine the effectiveness of these programs. If a particular strategy believed to be most effective has not, in fact, prevented a problem or assisted in its amelioration, we of course have learned something very important, namely that we do not understand the problem well enough to have chosen a method likely to work. If the method were merely weaker than we thought it would be, we could probably improve it; however, if it is completely ineffective we know one of two things, that either the prevention in any form is unworkable or we know so little about the problem that we could not think up an effective preventive method. If in contrast the assistance works reasonably well or as well as we predicted, we have the basis for a practical solution to a problem. We can then choose to improve the assistance method or we can decide whether we want to look for sufficient understanding of the problem so that we could anticipate its prevention, or we could study the problem so that we understood that it is the kind of problem which has to occur before it can be solved by the individual. Whichever of these approaches are taken, we end up knowing more about the nature of the problem than how to resolve it.

Programmatically we think that if there were five critical problems of beginning teachers, that with a set of between five and ten experiments sufficient progress could be made that we would have the basis for developing preventive and assistance strategies which would be more comprehensive.

By this time the reader is probably aware of the nature of the strategy that we are proposing. We propose in-depth analysis of the problems of beginning teachers and then an experimental attack on their causes by trying methods which would eliminate the problem. Such methods will work only if we have a fairly good understanding of their origins, and we are suggesting here that the origins to seek first are those related to the perceptions of the problem and the capacities they can bring at any time to the solution of that problem. There may be more complex causes or origins than these, but in order to move in the direction of solutions without having to spend years in the study of the problems of beginning teachers, we are proposing a strategy which points to how the problem can be resolved if its cause is the kind that can be eliminated in advance.

Consider this example. Suppose that the cause of, the ultimate or final or most comprehensive cause of the management problems which beginning teachers have is that they are so anxious that their management strategies are ill-thought, ill-conceived and poorly directed. In other words, the beginning teacher is such a victim of anxiety that he or she cannot carry out a consistent pattern of behavior, cannot perceive the situation accurately enough to generate an intelligent approach to the management problem. This anxiety does not occur in its most intense form until the teacher is in the classroom. There may be anticipatory responses prior to the actual beginning of teaching, but the individual is not likely to be in an anxious state until he or she is in the situation which is the source of the anxiety. In this situation two approaches might be taken, 1) to try to prevent the anxiety by developing the skill of the trainee to such a high level that they are confident they can cope with the situation; 2) to work with the trainee as the anxiety occurs to ameliorate it. (Obviously the solution may require some combinatin of these two strategies.)

If we try a relatively weak training strategy, the likelihood of eliminating the problem or drastically reducing the significance of the anxiety is unlikely. So we know in advance that if the cause may be the anxiety, whether or not we actually know that it is, we know that we have to have a sufficiently powerful treatment to eliminate that cause or to reduce its influence on the behavior of the beginning teacher. If we construct an experiment therefore, with the most thorough training that we can give to cope with the management problem, and the trainees still are extremely anxious and become disorganized, we know that even though we may not precisely have identified anxiety as the cause, we know that acquiring the necessary skills is not going to eliminate that cause.

The strategy of working with the candidate enables us to trace the steps of giving the beginning teacher strategies which, if they work, ought to reduce his or her anxiety. We would notice that they were very anxious about their management problems, we would recommend certain things that they might do, help them learn how to do those things, watch them as they did them, and if those procedures work we should see a reduction in anxiety. If the anxiety is paramount, the addition of skills will not alleviate it, and that fact should be apparent. Thus by looking at how each of our strategies works we can in fact identify the causes while at the same time we are working on a solution of the problem.

We are proposing, therefore, a method whose purpose is to simultaneously identify causes through a process of attempting different kinds of solutions. Depending upon which solutions work, we can develop a fairly clear idea of the causes of the original problem.

Such a strategy may appear to be too indirect for some people. We are going to propose another strategy which, at least in appearance, is more direct but lacks any experimental tests. We know from a wide variety of work on problems of this general character, that the ultimate test of the cause of the problem is the solution which eliminates it--because to eliminate the problem the solution has to be sufficiently refined that in the process of refining it we will be testing various causes of the problem.

The difficulties we foresee with the strategy we are proposing are of two kinds; one, as a community of researchers we are going to have to learn how to use this strategy because we have had very little experience in using it. There may be some resistance initially to using it through lack of understanding of the power of the method. We hasten to add that the quantitative techniques for analyzing data from such experiments or the methods for designing them are well known. Experiments of considerable efficiency can be generated with small numbers of participants by using a variety of fractional factorial designs, for example. It may be necessary to develop a program of intensive study of potential designs in order to mount a program of research of the kind that we are proposing. There are sufficient number of individuals around who could design relatively inexpensive and highly efficient experiments to work through the kind of strategy which we are proposing here.

The other difficulty that we foresee is that the creative and inventive minds of our colleagues are likely to generate a large number of training alternatives or potential causes or variables which may be influential. Our preference is for a targetted, focussed line of research that makes progress rather than a diffuse and seemingly comprehensive but ineffective strategy. We are urging therefore that the first stage which is described in the preceding pages be carefully conducted and that this second stage be started only with problems which have been sharply defined and clearly identified as critical. It is possible to begin now with some problems which we are reasonably sure are likely to turn up in the more corehensive, in-depth studies. The management problem appears to be a place where some experimental work could be done.

Improving the Efficiency and Economy of These Experiments

One way in which greater power from this research strategy may be achieved is to include experienced teachers in these experimental programs as the beneficiaries of the treatments. It is known that there are teachers in the system who have deficiencies which were not eliminated in training or were not corrected in the early years of induction into the profession. It might be possible, and does not seem unlikely, that through such agencies as Teacher Centers it would be possible to mount strategies for helping teachers which could be built into an experimental design. Many Teacher Centers at the present time have some type of course work on management, human relations, and other euphenisms for dealing with management and discipline problems.

Furthermore, these problems are always of interest to large numbers of teachers so that even if a teacher is not having a critical management problem, he or she may participate in a program to improve their skills. The popularity of Project-Teach in New York City is a clear example of this point.

The value of working with experienced teachers is that if some problems are eliminated that improves the quality of inferences that can be made from the design. Some of these teachers will have resolved basic kinds of problems and have sufficiently stabilized their teaching styles and strategies so that there is not considerable interaction among such variables as learning how to teach more effectively, using a consistent style, being organized over time, and a host of other variables that apparently interact in a kind of Brownian movement in the life of the beginning teacher.

With the experienced teachers, however, one would be working on the various types of assistance programs since whatever problems they may be having are no longer preventable in their inception. But by working with these experienced teachers it might be possible to identify the probable origins of the kinds of problems they are having. Certainly it is possible to observe the problems in context and to identify their immediate causes if not their more remote causes.

One could therefore, test with these experienced teachers various forms of assistance which would have several practical advantages. First, the basic advantage one would obtain with experienced teachers is the same one would obtain with beginning teachers, namely testing the power of an assistance method. Secondly, different kinds of practical arrangements for providing assistance methods could be tested out in the context of a real school system. Third, the participating teachers are most likely to make a real contribution both to the development of a solution and to its improvement because many of them will be able to think about their problems without the anxieties and trauma which the beginning teacher is experiencing. They are more likely to be useful to themselves and to the investigators as co-investigators of the problem.

The practical benefit to an organization such as the Teacher Center is that a program of this kind will provide the Teacher Center with a tested means of helping teachers. The Teacher Center can also commandeer the advice of expert teachers on developing the solutions.

A Teacher Center that could work with both the training program and the group of experienced teachers would be a particularly useful institution for the purposes of studying these problems. We are then approaching something like the beginnings of the induction schemes which were used in Great Britain, some of which utilized Teacher Centers.

The advantage of the strategy we are proposing here, however, is that it does not use the Teacher Center as a resource which already has a developed solution to a problem. The truth of the matter is that neither Teacher Centers nor teacher educators have any special solutions to these problems as far as anyone can determine. Since Teacher Centers collect the most experienced and some of the more expert teachers in their bank of resources, and since these individuals are likely to be closer to the problems, the Teacher Center offers a special resource in experience.

A word need be said about uneconomical uses of this experimental strategy. We think attepting to build a strategy into a total program of teacher education is probably wasteful. There are simply too many variables likely to interact in such a situation to achieve unambiguous or at least reasonably clear results. The problem with the internship, for example, is that it has so many components in it that it is impossible to tell which component produced which effects, even if we had good information on what the effects might be. Also it is very difficult to create variations across an entire program. The early studies on modeling and feedback conducted in the acquisition of teaching skills conducted at Stanford, the micro-teaching experiments, demonstrated how to conduct experiments within the context of an on-going program. One can train on specific aspects of teaching in several different ways, each of which is a potentially sound activity within the context of the same program. But to attempt to create two or more programs different in several different respects in the strands of the program creates an experimental situation which is too complex to mount, administer and evaluate. These programs usually are not large enough to create a sufficient number of variations.

The programs which we observed have features which could easily be segregated out for more intensive study of the kind we are describing. The summer program at Temple might be the source of several ideas on experimental variations both at Temple and other institutions. The program of supervision that is part of the University of Oregon's on-site teaching program might also be varied in ways that will provide us more information on effective prevention procedures or assistance procedures.

But there is another strategy which could be mounted to identify causes and a policy decision need be made as to the balance between the experimental strategy proposed here and the correlational strategy which we will describe in the next section.

CORRELATIONAL ANALYSES OF CAUSES OF BEGINNING TEACHERS' PROBLEMS

Despite the poor press that correlational studies are routinely given by educational researchers, correlational methods have been developed to such a point that it is possible to identify potential causes with sufficient surety that a more refined experimental program can be mounted; or, if it is not possible to mount an experimental program, it will still be possible through these correlational studies to make reasonable judgments about probable causes, and then to test these inferences by a trial and error in the development of programs to ameliorate or eliminate the causes of the problems.

A descriptive study needs to be the first stage of any correlational study. In this type of study the dependent variable is the kinds of problems the beginning teachers are having. So an important element in the strategy would be a study of a cohort of beginning teachers to identify what kinds of problems they were having, with what frequency and what severity.

The next step is to identify categories of potential causes and to gather data for each of the teachers in the cohort about the frequency of these potential causes in their lives.

Such categories are features of the training program, characteristics of the beginners, and characteristics of the context in which they are teaching. Among the characteristics of the training programs in which the beginning teachers have participated might be such variables as the amount of practical experience during the program, the amount of training on certain kinds of skills thought to be relevant to the solution of problems, the variety of training experiences relevant to the program which are provided, and so forth. Personality characteristics of the trainees might be proneness to anxiety, capacities to cope with stress, problem-solving abilities, self-esteem, and other characteristtcs related to adaptive and coping behaviors and problem-solving skills and aptitudes. Characteristics related to the background of the trainee might include the kinds of life experiences they have had which would prepare them for the kinds of problems which they are having as teachers; or particular kinds of interpersonal relationships which would either facilitate or interfere with their relating to pupils in their classes. We think here particularly of difficulties with authority relations which might lead the trainee to be too prone to exercise authority or not to exercise it. Variables related to context might be the kinds of pupils being taught, and the nature of the curriculum being used, the socio-economic characteristics of the families of the pupils, the racial-ethnic mix of pupils, and others.

Some of these variables are not "causes" in the strict sense of the term. The racial-ethnic mix of a class is not the cause of a teacher's problems with that class but it obviously creates conditions which must be adapted to or utilized constructively. It is the lack of understanding of these conditions or a lack of skill in using them productively that would be the cause of the problem--not the mixture of children in itself. It is a common mistake in the analysis of the problems of teachers to attribute the causes of an identifiable problem to the children in the class rather than to what, in fact, is causing the problem, insufficiencies in the teacher's preparation for working with such children and more immediately their lack of skill in working with these children.

Other contextual factors may have a much more direct effect on the teacher. The directives of an administrator, for example, can "cause" real problems for a teacher which only the most skillful teachers might be able to surmount. We can think of examples where the administration has set up an attendance keeping system that is extremely complicated and which almost invariably overwhelms beginners. Experienced teachers learn how to "get around" this system, but a beginner may expend considerable time using the attendance system--which creates discipline problems for him or her. The problem is in the system being required, and not in the capacities of the beginning teacher, unless we are willing to insist that beginning teachers ought to learn how to work around ineffective methods imposed by administrators.

The first step in this study will be to define as precisely as possible the variety of these independent variables. At this stage, the best that can be done is to think of as many of them as can be measured reasonably well. We have no guiding theories of any genuine substance or meaning that would enable us to eliminate some variables. We are reasonably certain that causes will be found in the categories that we have described here, but what variables within any of these categories are most likely to be the causes of teacher problems is largely a matter of speculation or inference. Rather than make selections at this point it would be better to use this experience to generate as many variables as can be comprehended for measurement in a study.

We now have, therefore, a group, perhaps relatively large, of independent variables, and perhaps a much smaller group of dependent variables, namely the problems of beginning teachers. A sample of cohort of beginning teachers in a variety of places and contexts would be chosen. Information on all of these variables will be gathered on each of these individuals.

From this point on the study, once the data has been gathered, is a quantitative-analytic study. The steps are well known, beginning with the development of the correlation matrix. A preliminary step of doing cluster analyses or non-metric scaling or factor analyses of the variables should seriously be considered to reduce their number and to see if there are clusters of them which have meaning. Once this reduction in the number of variables has been tried, the investigator is then ready to construct the basic correlation matrix.

To develop the correlation matrix the investigator simply correlates all of the independent variables with each other and with each of the dependent variables, and also computes the intercorrelations among the dependent variables. The first step is simply to produce out of this correlation matrix the significant zero order correlations. Unfortunately too many investigators in this type of study stop at this point. We suspect that the same problems will occur in this type of analysis as have occurred in other studies of teacher behavior. Clearly it is a mistake to stop at the zero order correlations because the number of significant ones is usually relatively small, and the pattern among them may not be understandable, so the investigator is left inventing patterns for which the correlational results provide only meager support. Multivariant methods should be used and the analysis of zero order correlations should simply be a first step in developing the investigator's understanding of his or her own data.

Several different methods of multi-variate analysis are available. Multiple regression and stepwise regressions of several different kinds can be tried. These analyses usually would produce, if there are any interrelations in the data, some patterns which would enable the investigator to state which variables contribute most to a prediction of the occurrence, the frequency or the severity of the problems which are the dependent variables.

We recommend also the use of more complex methods of proceeding to more comprehensive causal analyses. The methods of path analysis and similar partial correlational methods are becoming more frequently used in educational research, are widely known and are strongly recommended for this kind of research. A number of models of the interdependencies among these categories of variables could be generated and each of these could be tested by path analyses methods.

The product of a study of this kind will be some judgments about the relative importance of training in relation to personality characteristics and of each of the variables in these categories with respect to each other and with respect to variables in other categories.

What no correlational method tests very well is the interactions among variables. Only experimental methods give us highly valid information in that respect. But as a first step we can detect the major sources of potential causes, and if methods like path analysis are used, we will have eliminated any number of competing rival hypotheses about the causal relations impinging on a particular variable. The severity of a particular problem, for example, would be shown to be a function or not a function of the amount of previous training on skills relevant to the the problem or the amount of prior experience with the problem or the anxiety proneness of the individual teacher.

These variables might in actuality interact in some way but that possibility would show up in intercorrelations among them in the original matrix or in the relative weights of these variables in a stepwise regression. So considerable progress can be made, and even though one is working with a complex correlational matrix, one does not have to resort to years of tinkering with the correlational matrix in order to understand relations among the variables which are quantitatively portrayed in that matrix.

The only problem with this kind of study is its scope, and a decision has to be made as to whether or not proceeding along this research line is an effective research strategy. We are contrasting this correlational strategy with the experimental strategy, and suggesting that there are advantages to both. The correlational strategy is usually the best strategy as a first step or first phase, if it is followed by experiments derived from what is learned in this phase. But funding agencies are frequently so eager for results, or they have to accommodate the political necessities of deciding who will conduct various phases, that the integration between the various steps may be lost. If it is likely to be lost, then there is little point in doing a first stage as comprehensive as the one that we are proposing here. Its value lies precisely in its ability to make a second stage more meaningful and more precise.

The other consideration is whether there is sufficient payoff in this respect to postpone the very large payoffs that can be achieved with experimental studies. It is very difficult to sort out these benefits because we know so little about the problems in these areas that there is no way to guarantee that the experimental strategy is more likely to be effective than a two-stage strategy in which correlational studies constitute the first stage. Considerable progress could be made with the experimental strategy if it is systematic and heavily based on strong inference. If a network of hypotheses is developed among investigators, and several different investigators go to work on testing these various hypotheses in the experimental mode, then that strategy is likely to pay off relatively quickly. But if the system is to be a fractionated system of experiments unrelated conceptually to each other, then the best procedure is to begin with the correlational study which would lay the basis for an experimental program.

As the above comments suggest, the determination of how to proceed has to be made on the basis of being able to put together a consistent and coherent strategy. It is the consistency and coherence that is likely to pay off, and there is no real protection against a poorly planned strategy, except to eliminate the poor planning.

Summary

It may be useful at this point to review very briefly what we have been proposing by way of strategies for identifying the causes of the problems of beginning teachers. We have proposed two starting points which may be interchanged or made interdependent. We could begin by doing a correlational study using the most sophisticated methods of correlational analysis to identify a domain of probable causes of particular kinds of problems. Or we could begin by using experimental methods to test different solutions to particular kinds of problems. These solutions would be generated from hypotheses about potential or probable causes which in effect the experimental methods would test. The solutions which were most effective would by their very nature reveal the kind of cause which is creating the problem.

In using the experimental method we suggested the specific solution methods be fitted into two categories, preventive methods and assistance methods. By doing this we can learn when the problem is best resolved as well as the most effective particular method for solving the problem. We also will learn that certain kinds of problems probably need both some prevention and some assistance.

The two strategies can be combined by first conducting the comprehensive correctional study out of which sets of probable causes are identified. Then the experimental method is tuned to more careful tests of the likely causes and at the same time will help develop methods for their solution.

At several points we have noted that the design problems here are not the critical problems. The kinds of studies we are talking about can be designed relatively easily, and the analytic and the quantitative methods which should be used with these types of approaches are well known. The sampling problems do not present real difficulties. Some measurement problems will have to be resolved, mostly in the form of developing measures of variables which have not been measured before at least in educational settings, or some greater precision in measurement will have to be achieved.

The real problem is developing a coherent and consistent strategy and developing some economy within that strategy so that it is not extraordinarily expensive. Here, of course, we run up against an attitude that is all too prevalent in education, namely the attitude that unless large samples of individuals are involved, the corresponding knowledge is not likely to be valid. It is obviously impossible to mount studies of thousands of teachers, and even studies of hundreds of teachers are probably not within the realm of possibility. But by a series of carefully designed smaller studies which replicate and complement each other, and which nest experimental conditions within a series of successive experiments it is possible to arrive at valid and reliable knowledge with great economy.

Perhaps the first order of business ought to be a careful planning of the methodological strategy that might be used in an attack on this area of problems. The task strikes us as rather straightforward, comprehensible and realizable. The goal would be to bring together some of the best minds in research strategy and give them a very concrete problem to solve, namely the design of a series of studies, limited in scope and fiscal resources, which would answer the kinds of questions which we have raised here. We are thinking of something much smaller in scale than the kinds of conferences at the National Institute of Education developed in the area of research on teaching several years ago. Its panel on methodology is like what we have in mind, but the panel would be given a very concrete design problem to solve.

An alternative strategy might be to develop a request for design proposals which would be open to competetive bidding. Again the problem would be to state the specific goals and to request that bidders submit designs with appropriate cost analyses which might be used by the National Institute of Education for studying this problem. The United States Civil Rights Commission did this a number of years ago in an attempt to design a second Coleman Study. That request for proposal was a two page letter which specified what needed to be done. But in that letter was the statement of the condition that the design should eliminate the defects of the original Coleman Study; the request simply specified what the intentions of the study were and what kinds of problems to avoid. Something similar to that could be done in this area and the result might be that the National Institute of Education would have a wide variety of proposals to consider with comparative costs and any other kinds of considerations which the Institute might impose upon the design.

Thus we think it is well within the state of the research art to generate such a program and the payoff in terms of the solution of this problem would be considerable. There would also be considerable spinoff into uses of what is learned in these studies in inservice programs.

We stress here again several points which are essential if an effort of this kind at identifying causes is to be mounted in a systematic way. First, there has to be the recognition that this is the critical phase of research in this area. If that is not recognized, we are back to where we are today--much speculation about what these causes might be and sporadic and shotgun approaches to resolving the problems of beginning teachers. Hopefully we can learn from our experience to this point in time. Second, any program of research of this particular kind requires the cooperation of teacher educators and teachers' organizations as well as the administrations of particular school districts or state agencies. The research program ought to be used as an opportunity to create models of such cooperation as part of the process of generating knowledge and information about the problems of beginning teachers. Third, the development of this research strategy ought to capitalize on the knowledge and experience of practitioners. This knowledge and experience is sadly missing from the literature on the problems of beginning teachers, except insofar as experienced teachers are the respondents to survey questionnaires. We think, particularly in the area of providing solutions, that the experience of practitioners can be capitalized on at least to create the first generation of hypotheses to be tested. They also have a much keener sense of what is likely to be workable in a classroom and that experience ought to be utilized in considering the kinds of solutions to problems which will be tested.

The truth of the matter may be that we can make little progress in understanding the bases of effectiveness in teaching unless we can identify why beginning teachers have the problems which they have. This understanding may be the key to our understanding of the bases of teaching effectiveness. Approached from that point of view, it is possible to see the study of the problems of beginning teachers as a way to resolve other kinds of problems and as a way to make progress much more rapidly in developing solutions to how to help teachers become more professionally competent.

CREATING AND TESTING SOLUTIONS

The reader may be surprised by the opening of this new section since we have been talking about studying the problems of beginning teachers. But we think there are a number of other research strategies which may be used to develop and test ideas about how to help beginning teachers. This study, in fact, is one study of ways to help beginning teachers. The information which we have produced here collects, summarizes and evaluates what we currently know about helping these beginning teachers. The problem is that we do not know very much and the strategies we are about to suggest in this section are other ways of improving our understanding as we also proceed along the lines of research which have been recommended in the preceeding sections.

We think a comprehensive strategy of collecting potential solutions and doing some evaluating of them is a research strategy which might be useful as a source of ideas which could be tested more carefully in experimental work or which might be analyzed as part of the problems of conducting a correlational-analytic study of beginning teachers problems. The type of study we have in mind would proceed in the following way. We would first identify places where programs are focussed on particular problems of beginning teachers or the similar or identical problems of experienced teachers. We are also thinking of capitalizing on activities which are now in progress. Project-Teach, for example, is being conducted in New York City and in a number of other places. It may be possible to develop studies around such an on-going project so that we can understand what kinds of influences it may have on the acquisition of skills necessary to resolve certain kinds of beginning teachers problems. It might be possible to take a group of people who have gone through an intensive course such as Project-Teach and follow them as they proceed through the course to find out what their problems are, how they see the information that they are receiving, and the strengths and the weaknesses of that information. A relatively small number of studies of this kind might yield very practical information as well as some evaluative data. By practical information we mean approaches which people are taking and which appeal to teachers, or which teachers can use easily, or which can be put into systems of training or education for teachers easily. The evaluative data would tell us how effective these various methods are.

We know that an important feature of some of these programs is the opportunities they provide for teachers to discuss their problems. It may be that the simple interchange of information among teachers will turn out to be one of the more effective methods for dealing with problems. If it is, then we need to learn practical ways to bring teachers together to exchange ideas and information. If it is not a very effective method, we ought to lay that mythology to rest rather than pursuing a mythology in which nostrums and patent medicines are passed on from one teacher to another. We are not promoting any particular strategy or method or institution which promotes programs. We are suggesting, rather, collecting instances where various kinds of ways of helping teachers are being tried and studying them in detail and in depth.

On the basis of our investigations we would recommend studying in depth the Temple University summer program; the early phases of induction of teachers in the Oregon program; the Lincoln, Nebraska, or Houston or New Orleans teacher assistance schemes, and the Jefferson County, Colorado program. Of these programs two are in universities and are part of the teacher preparation programs. The other four programs are district sponsored programs for beginning teachers. The Houston and New Orleans programs may have developed sufficiently by this time to provide sufficient data for the purposes of the kind of study we are proposing.

We would also recommend a detailed study of the State of Georgia program. Among the distinguishing features of this program are its sophisticated assessment system and the ways in which beginning teachers may receive help once their performance has been assessed. This system is also integrated into a larger system of evaluation prior to the beginning of teaching. The Georgia system would be particularly useful for studying the long-term development of the teacher. A sample of trainees could be selected at the time they are admitted to teacher trainee programs and their development through the preservice program, through the system of state evaluation into the beginning months of teaching and on to the end of the first year could be studied. It would be possible, by using individuals going through this system, to look at different aspects of a program such as the selection procedures, different kinds of preservice training programs, different kinds of contexts during the first year of teaching, the particular types of assistance given for each kind of problem identified, and the effects of these forms of assistance. In our opinion the

Georgia system provides an excellent opportunity to study a wide variety of problems and to carry these studies over as many years as seem worthwhile; certainly each year's data will produce some results.

If a complete system like the Georgia system was then contrasted with the other kinds of programs, it would be possible to make comparisons of the different methods across programs and of the influence of various contexts on the effectiveness of these programs.

It might be useful in organizing the results of a set of evaluations like this to consider constructing a chart which would place people in terms of the time in the stage of development at which observations are made. Then comparisons can be made within this strata across various types of programs.

Perhaps the most useful basic form of design for these types of studies is what is known as the "subject-as-his-own-control". An assessment is made of each individual in a group at the time that the initial observations are made and subsequent assessments are related to this initial assessment and, successively, to each other. The results could be portrayed as a series of lines showing progressive changes.

STUDIES OF THE LONG-TERM PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHERS

We note here the importance and relevance of studies of long-term professional development of teachers. Any comprehensive program of study of teachers ought to observe them at three different stages, one, during the preservice period; two, during the transition period, and three, at one or more points in time after that. The problem with long-term stages of development is that so many factors influence what is happening that it is difficult to attribute causality in a sufficiently precise manner.

But studies of development are worth doing because they reveal regularities across contexts, if there are any regularities in the events being observed. Such studies would describe for us what teachers are like at major points in their careers as teachers. This kind of base-line data helps in understanding a wide variety of different kinds of phenomena. It is also useful for estimating the frequency with which certain kinds of problems, changes and crises occur and the circumstances in which they are most likely to occur. This type of study also lays the groundwork for looking at life events which might be highly related, even causally related to changes and crises in the person's development.

Although developmental studies are not as fashionable as they once were, their value for providing fundamentally important information is indisputable. Unfortunately, developmental studies are seen as less important right at a time when we are becoming much more interested in the changes that occur in adult life. Historically most developmental studies were of younger people, most notably children, and the tracing of development stopped at the post-adolescent period. The belief is rather widespread that changes occur over time in adults. The popularity of the concept of "Passages" is an illustration of the interest in ideas and data of these kinds.

These studies of the development of teachers are worthwhile in their own right, and also as they relate to a variety of problems in the schools such as the nature of the teaching career, the phenomena burn-out, and the creation of effective schools. Their importance to the understanding of the problems of beginning teachers is that we will be able to analyze in what respects the transition period is critical for later professional development or lack of it.

POLICY STUDIES

An important set of studies are those related to policy issues. We think that these studies should be initiated at the same time as intensive studies of the problems of beginning teachers, or experimental studies of the causes of the problems of beginning teachers, or the evaluation studies which we suggested above. We are assuming two lines of research and development work, one, a line of fundamental research on the nature of the problems of beginning teachers and ways of resolving them; the others on the questions which have to be answered or the problems which have to be solved in order to create a structure of teacher education and professional development which will incorporate the results of this research and development.

We have pointed out that responsibility for assisting beginning teachers during the transition phase has not been allocated to any institution or agency in any completely satisfying way. An attempt to build a structure for such purposes inevitably raises policy issues and therefore it is important to do some policy research on critical questions about how programs for beginning teachers can be institutionalized.

The first set of questions which need to be answered pertain to the problem of who will be responsible for developing these programs for beginning teachers. Ordinarily, answers to this question might be postponed until we had determined what forms of program where most effective; knowing this, we could then allot responsibilities for program development and related tasks to the agency which could best carry out the effective form of program. But the research may not reveal what is the most effective agency, and it is not even necessary to design studies to test whether the results are better mediated by the university or the Teacher Center or a state agency. The evaluative studies which we suggested above will shed some light on that problem in any case.

The problem is to begin to talk through the political problems involved in creating a new structure of teacher education. Should the teachers' organizations be responsible for programs of beginning teachers? Should the assistance of the beginning teachers at this stage in their career be allocated primarily to the local school district? Should the university have a continuing role to play in programs for beginning teachers? What kinds of tasks and responsibilities can be assigned to these different organizations? What kinds of cooperative systems might be built? Should these various programs be linked or not linked to the evaluation procedures of local school districts or to certification procedures?

Who will bear the costs of these programs? Can these costs be allocated from existing programs or organizations or must they be add-ons? What assumptions are we willing to make about how well trained teachers should be by the time they begin teaching? What are the relative costs of preparing teachers to different levels of preparedness for teaching? How do these costs compare with those of assisting teachers after they have begun to teach? Are there forms of preservice training which might combine the ordinary functions of preservice training with assistance during the transition period? The internship occurs as an example, but we need to evaluate different forms of the internship before we agree that it may be the most useful modality of this kind.

What kinds of scheduling arrangements can be made which would facilitate the progress of the beginning teacher? Should they be given days on which they could go to Teacher Centers or to university centers for special kinds of help or for working with a master teacher or tutorial teacher? (The James report in England in 1972 recommended that first-year teachers have one day free to go to Teacher Centers as a way of expanding their education and training.)

Who will be responsible for conducting assistance programs for beginning teachers or working intensively with them to prepare them for the experiences of the transition period? Should experienced teachers be used for this purpose? If they are, what kind of an assignment will they have? Will they combine teaching with working with beginning teachers? What is the most economical arrangement for using experienced teachers for this purpose? What changes in their status or position need to be made? Will they receive some form of additional or special compensation? How will they be selected? Will they need to be trained?

What role will university and college faculty play in these assistance programs or evaluation and training programs? Who will be responsible for initiating the study of these problems? Who will fund their study? Who will make decisions based on the results of these studies?

Do we need a new system of cooperation among teacher organizations, university and college personnel, local school districts, administrators and state agency personnel? Should we create task forces to work on these problems at the present time? Would it be better to fund a set of studies in different states to work on the same basic kinds of problems with a view to looking at these problems from the perspective of a particular state? Would it be better to divide the problems and create task forces in several states to work on only one major category of problems?

What ought to be the role of the teachers' organizations in these policy studies? Should some policy studies be conducted by teachers' organizations because by doing so we would obtain better data and we would obtain the interest and cooperation of teachers' organizations? How do we accommodate the interests of local school districts which are frequently parochial?

Should we set up studies to define more precisely the criteria of effective professional development? Do we need a think-tank for generating ideas about different kinds of assistance programs or professional development programs? Should we plan some pilot studies of systems for assisting teachers?

Most of these questions can be answered in a reasonable way without having the kind of research and development data which we expect as the outcome of the other set of studies which we have proposed. Many of the questions which we have listed here are questions which require discussion among different interested parties, and will be answered only by involving different individuals or organizations who are willing to work together on a solution. We think that a set of task forces ought to be created to sharpen these questions and to expand them. Then, either staffs can be allocated to these task forces who will conduct the specific studies, or some of the work might be parcelled out through the ordinary funding mechanisms.

EVALUATION OF MAJOR PROGRAM-TYPES

Should the internship be evaluated? This question cannot be answered straightforwardly because there is no such thing as a single kind of internship which can be evaluated and compared to a single alternative system of training. One of the reasons evaluation of programs in teacher education is usually poorly done is that these evaluations attempt to study too much. The passage of an individual through a training program or an assistance program from the time they enter it to the time they leave it is a complex passage. Many things happen in the individual and, unless we know what is happening to the individual with some precision, it is almost impossible to make fairly sound evaluative judgments about the effectiveness of programs.

Programs are rarely tightly designed systems. They tend to be loose aggregations of events and their associated experiences and even though components of them have the same name, the substance or details or arrangements in these programs vary from one institution or system to another. We really do not know what the independent variables are in any single program. Furthermore, it is probably unwise to treat these programs as merely a collection of independent variables. They are in reality clusters of interacting and interdependent variables and the process of defining them precisely and sorting out their relative influence quantitatively is a fairly complex problem.

We are inclined to discourage comparing the internship to an assistance scheme, which we are afraid is an idea that will occur almost immediately to people who want to answer the question: is it better to prepare teachers for the transition period or to help them during it? We suggest that that question cannot be answered well enough to attempt to answer it.

Rather, we ought to find out precisely how far an internship takes an individual in terms of their development as an effective teacher, and how the internship helps them to master the transition period. We then ought to find out in what ways the assistance programs build on what has been learned in the preservice program, the degree to which they undo what has been learned there, and how much of a change or difference they make in helping the beginning teacher through the transition period. These kinds of questions obviously need to be answered before one can build a program that has coherence and direction and power. Until we have such programs it is pointless to compare them.

Once progress has been made on understanding the problems of beginning teachers and their causes, and after we have collected some basic data about how critical certain kinds of components in these different programs are or how powerful they may be or can be, we can design meaningful alternatives of the two major kinds of programs. The British did this for their assistance schemes. We suggest that a more useful approach will be to first do the kinds of research we have proposed and then to create the assistance schemes. With that qualification it is as useful to compare different types of assistance schemes as it is to compare different formats of internships. We wish to stress that only certain parts of these larger programs are genuinely different across programs, and until these differences are clearly identified and sharpened our evaluation work is unnecessarily complex and time-consuming.

SOME PRAGMATIC SUGGESTIONS AND METHODOLOGICAL NOTES

We have described two kinds of studies which we believe need to be done, research and development studies and policy studies. We have also urged that they be done simultaneously because, although they are interconnected on some matters, they are not totally or largely interdependent. These studies are to be directed to resolving issues of authority and responsibility, allocation of training functions, and allocation of resources. They are intertwined with the larger issue of improving the effectiveness of the current staff of teachers in our schools, and the policy matters in these respects are not being extensively debated, particularly as teacher centers emerge as new forces in the education of teachers.

Also at this time, we are probably witnessing a rejection of traditional modes of preparing teachers. Numerous proposals for reform of preservice education are again being made, and fundamental structures in this system are likely to be changed. The certification system, for example, has been under study for some time, and we are now witnessing numerous efforts to require licensing examinations for teachers. That particular change will inevitably require changes in the pattern of preservice training which, in turn, will affect how competent teachers are when they begin to teach and how well prepared they are for continuing professional growth.

We are also witnessing numerous attempts to expand the power of teachers to control their own professional development. Teacher centers are a symbolic and real effort in this respect; but other efforts are being made through the expansion of continuing education programs conducted under the direction of teacher organizations.

Obviously this a period of ferment and change. Historically in such periods the problems of beginning teachers were used only as a weapon with which to cudgel those who were being held responsible for the ineffectiveness of the teachers. But such changes, as were then promoted and implemented, apparently have done little to change the character of the experiences of beginning teachers. New reforms may not do any better in this respect. Rather than again use the problems of beginning teachers as a weapon to promote some other cause, we are recommending that policy studies be focused on how to solve the problems of beginning teachers. We would expect that out of those studies recommendations will come which substantially change the structure of teacher education and improve it in all of its major phases: the preservice period, the transition period, and the inservice period.

We are, therefore, reiterating the recommendations made earlier in this chapter that full attention be given to these policy studies and that they be directed to resolving the policy issues which must be resolved if the problems of beginning teachers are to receive the kind of support which they obviously deserve.

Such policy studies will neither be effective nor accepted if they do not involve all groups which have an important stake in what happens to teachers in the transition period. Of all groups, those who happens to teachers in the transition period. Of all groups, those who have the largest stake are the teachers themselves. They need, therefore, to be represented officially; they need to be consulted; they need to participate in discussions and analyses; they should also participate in and perhaps even direct and conduct, policy and research studies.

The argument that teachers have gone through the transition period and therefore deserve to have a say in what is done to change its nature is an emotionally appealing one. It is also an eminently sensible one because teachers will have the motivation to do something about the problem, because they will have ideas about how to solve the problem, and because it may be essential that they themselves conduct the major form of programs to help teachers through this beginning period. Up until now we have used only very limited approaches to solving the problems of beginning teachers: a revised, revamped, and upgraded form of the traditional program, which we call the internship, and, more recently, on the job induction programs during the early days of teaching. These programs are largely conducted by people who have always conducted the education, training and supervision of teachers, teacher educators and administrators. Teachers play secondary roles in these programs.

Perhaps now is the time to seriously consider efforts to have teachers themselves assume responsibility, direction, and leadership in designing ways of helping beginning teachers. This suggestion is not intended to denigrate the contributions of teacher educators or others nor to suggest that their ideas are shopworn or that they are no longer aviable source of reform and improvement. Many teacher educators have ideas which simply never have been tried, or have not been tried to the degree which they themselves have recommended. But they have always borne the blame for the inadequacies of their programs. Perhaps a shift in responsibility, a sharing of responsibility, or an allocating of responsibility for different kinds of functions across teacher educators and experienced teachers will change the focus of training and create better programs as well as redistribute responsibility.

Methodological Suggestions

We have made a major methodological recommendation in the kind of research and development program we have suggested. We have steered away from recommending traditional types of evaluation and research design. We do not think it wise to compare program A against program B, or type A against type B. It strikes us as pointless, methodologically unsound and intellectually impoverished to contrast induction schemes with preservice programs, or internships with induction schemes, or one kind of internship with another kind.

The reason for not making that kind of a recommendation is that none of these programs are so well developed that they constitute a homogeneous and consistent treatment or intervention. Even the internships which have been around for over twenty years and are largely successful are admixtures of many different kinds of practices each of whose effects on the interns is unknown, except from the impressions or the experiences of people who have observed these programs closely. These programs also represent a limited number of forms of the possibilities at hand in the internship. Largely for practical reasons the internship tends to be an experience in one school extended over a year. We have not tried many of the possible types of internship experiences that might be designed for longer or shorter duration.

We have recommended, therefore, that research on existing programs, whether they be internships or induction programs, be conducted on segments, portions, units or modules of these programs. An example of such a study might be the following. The Stanford program has a summer program which is largely simulation training, carefully focusing on the acquisition of skills believed to be necessary for the beginning teacher. Temple University also has a summer program which has experiences like the simulation experiences in the Stanford program, but has a substantial component of realistic classroom experiences. It ought to be possible to compare the teaching of the interns in both of these programs during the first three months of their teaching.

One would begin by listing and describing in detail and developing measures for a set of critical problems of beginning teachers which usually occur during the first three months. Criteria would be established for what would constitute an effective solution of these problems. The interns would then be followed to determine the extent to which each intern had solved these problems, how they had solved the problems, and in what ways their training had prepared them for the solution of these problems. The interns could be observed; they could be talked to; they could keep records of their own experiences. Actually, the measurement involved in conducting the study would be relatively straightforward and simple.

Once these data are collected it is easy to make comparisons using the data to assess which interns managed to solve problems effectively and which did not. Further, an analysis could be made of how they solved the problems to see if differences emerged with each of these programs. The only other information that is needed to make the study a methodologically sound one is careful documentation of the kinds of experiences the interns had during their training.

It would be possible to conduct a study of a cohort of interns from the beginning of teaching through the critical periods of the induction phase which would provide two kinds of information--first, what the nature of their experiences is like and what kinds of factors seem to be potential causes of these experiences, and second, how do the different kinds of experiences being had by individuals who have had prior experience in different types of training programs compare? It should be possible to study multiple effects and to answer several different kinds of questions simultaneously out of a study of this kind. One need only be careful to collect data about the characteristics of the participants so as to be able to evaluate the hypothesis that it is the characteristics of the individuals that account for any difference. Any relevant information about competing rival hypotheses is relatively easy to collect. With information of this kind, it is possible to establish the relative importance of other factors by very ordinary quantitative methods, and in these ways to disprove claims that it is really the climate at Stanford that accounts for interns having or not having certain kinds of problems or that the inner-city experience of Philadelphia interns produces a set of problems that no one else is likely to have.

Another dimension could be added to this particular study simply by including interns at the University of Oregon. These beginning teachers have had preservice experience which includes student teaching, and therefore a much richer preservice experience than the interns from either of the other two programs. By including them we could analyze the importance of this preservice experience. This has been one of the major components in the proposals for the restructuring of education of teachers which has been in the literature for many years and which has been accepted by many teacher educators as the best way to prepare teachers. It would also be directly related to the kinds of policy questions which inevitably will arise as internships are given a place in the structure of teacher education as is about to be done in the State of New York.

Studying Induction Programs. These induction programs are so few in number and exist in such an early stage of development in most cases that a special problem is presented. We can use the British experience, generalizing carefully, of course, as a basis for developing programs in the United States. But two other ideas suggest themselves. The existing programs ought to systematically study how they help beginning teachers. None of these programs has any substantial data to indicate that they are making a difference in the lives of beginning teachers. It ought to be relatively easy to add resources to these programs so that they can study carefully what it is they are doing and what its effects are. We are thinking particularly of two programs which are in existence, those in Jefferson County, Colorado, and Lincoln, Nebraska, and of the programs which are getting underway in Houston and New Orleans. A data base in a very concrete form is necessary to get at what is happening in these programs and to ascertain what their limitations are.

We think, for example, that the Jefferson County program has many attractive features but is limited in two ways. One, it may not systematically address problems which beginning teachers have which are independent of the particular curriculum these beginning teachers are teaching. To some extent the district's goals may be attenuated by failing to work with these problems with the beginning teachers. The other limitation is that the strategy used may be administratively convenient but instructionally weak. There are obvious features which could be added to the Jefferson County strategy to improve it. It is important to identify whether these limitations are real and how they affect the experience of beginning teachers. Jefferson County is also an interesting site for studying how working with a curriculum of this kind stimulates or constrains the professional development of the teacher. It may be, for example, that beginning teachers are so shaped by the curriculum which they teach that they do not expand their capacity to teach beyond what is required of them in this curriculum. This question can be answered rather straightforwardly, and its answer is important because it would suggest that inservice programs for beginning teachers which are focused only on the needs of the district may be beneficial in the short run but that the long-term consequences are likely to be highly undesirable. Such a conclusion at the present is merely speculative, and it could be argued that developing a solid set of skills in which one is secure and efficient is precisely the kind of base one needs for future development in other ways.

But we think that if induction schemes are going to receive the kind of serious attention which they deserve, special efforts will have to be made to create programs of this kind in a variety of settings. We do not believe that all the possibilities which exist have begun to be tried. Some possibilities which are not now being used in practice will be suggested to illustrate this point.

We know of no districts that have a period of intensive training that precedes the beginning of school. All programs that we could locate had at best two or three days of training prior to the beginning of school. We cannot visualize how such limited training would make a substantial difference in how the beginning teacher faced the transition problem. Moreover, these days are also used for administrative matters, as well as for familiarizing the beginning teacher with the curriculum, and with the school's rules and policies.

The administrative responsibility for these programs is uniformly in the hands of school districts. As far as we have been able to find out, no teacher center has formally taken on the development of a program for beginning teachers, but our information here may be inaccurate and incomplete because of the limited amount of written information which is available on teacher center programs.

We have seen particular cases of beginning teachers being helped by personnel of a teacher center. We observed a teacher specialist at the New York Teacher Center working closely with a beginning teacher over a period of time, and the results were dramatically effective. The specialist not only helped the beginning teacher to acquire certain specific kinds of skills, and in this case skills which are usually not taught well in a preservice program, but also provided strong psychological support for the beginning teacher. It was a one-case demonstration of what might happen if teachers could use their teacher centers to help the beginning teachers in their locale. The results are reminiscent of the better schemes in the British induction program.

We also do not have any instances of programs that coordinate the preservice program with the inservice induction program except the

University of Oregon internship program. We need a test of whether or not the ordinary preservice program is sufficient if appropriate additional assistance is provided during the induction phase. The answer to such a question is necessary before practical decisions about the amount of training to offer new teachers as well as the location or timing of that training can be made.

But, the preservice programs ought to be selected carefully. The issue here is not whether any kind of a preservice program can be buttressed or complemented or supplemented by an induction program. Obviously, the kinds of induction programs that are likely to be effective will serve one or both of two functions. They will either provide assistance for development which can occur only as the result of experience on the job, or they will remedy deficiencies of the preservice program. It makes little sense to create programs in school districts which make up for what teacher education programs could do. Therefore, we suggest that the preservice programs selected be programs which have a consistent program where it is possible to trace carefully their effects to the time that the beginning teacher actually enters teaching.

We think that programs like that at Weber State College, which has a long history of running a competency-based program, ought to be studied because reports are that their teachers do very well at the beginning of teaching. It may be that the particular form of competency training which the program sponsors is most beneficial for beginning teachers. Two problems could be addressed by studying that program: whether that form of training or that kind of an intervention ameliorates or eliminates the typical problems of beginning teachers, and whether the training limits or affects positively the development of the teacher beyond the induction phase.

It might be pragmatically useful in many different ways to look also at preservice programs in New York State, which offer a number of variations on the competency-based model. The pragmatic advantages are that the different types of competency-based programs could be compared in terms of their effects on the induction phase, and the results of these studies could be used to shape the form that the internship might take as it is instituted in New York State on a statewide basis. In this way some of the larger policy issues could be worked out in practice because the internship has been recommended by a coalition of groups representing different organizations and has strong support. Many of the policy issues have been effectively resolved in New York State, but sufficient problems remain that this state might make an excellent site for study.

The State of Georgia obviously offers many opportunities for studying the kinds of problems and conducting the kinds of experiments which we have recommended. All of the arguments we have given above for using New York State as a potential site apply with equal, if not greater, force in Georgia. Their program is established and they have experience with it. Resources added to study how beginning teachers are mastering the induction phase as a consequence of what is being done in Georgia would seem to be as desirable as any study we can think of which utilizes ongoing programs.

The studies in these various places ought to be coordinated in terms of the kinds of problems of beginning teachers which are looked at, the kinds of data that are gathered, the ways in which programs are described. Coordinating these studies is the sensible and efficient thing to do and necessary if maximum power is to be obtained from any set of studies which might be conducted.

Notes on Experimental Design

We have been recommending explicitly that the scale and scope of these studies be smaller rather than larger. We make this recommendation because we are primarily concerned with estimating the power of a particular intervention. Rather than undertake large-scale studies of many interventions which may interact or difficult studies which estimate the power of an intervention, it is wiser in the beginning stage of the research to reduce the number of interventions and the complexities of the system in which they are imbedded so that their power might be tested. Progress can also be made more rapidly if critical information of this kind can be gathered more quickly, and it can be gathered more quickly by reducing the scale of study.

We are not, however, advocating laboratory studies or studies that are so small as to be of interest to only a researcher interested in instructional psychology or research on teacher training of an experimental kind. We are recommending genuine field experiments of reasonable size but not so large or conducted over such a long period of time that it will be a decade before the information can be used to develop practical programs.

What is probably lacking in the culture of the research community is sufficient knowledge about the kinds of experimental designs and studies which are possible. Fractional factorial designs have been available in the research methodology literature for years, yet we see few examples of their use in educational research. They are possible designs from which practical conclusions can be drawn which will have practical results, and they are extraordinarily economical. Some special consideration should be given to bringing into a research and development program the most expert individuals in research design, some of whom may have had relatively little experience with educational problems. We are thinking of individuals who know such topics as supersaturated experimental design, who are expert at professional factorial design experiments, or who are knowledgeable in more sophisticated forms of multivariate analysis. There is a literature on multiexperimental multivariate analysis, and we ought to be able to capture the interest of these individuals in designing the kinds of studies we have been suggesting here.

We have proposed a fairly sophisticated methodology in which experiments are used to accomplish two interrelated purposes, one, to determine the effects of an intervention and, two, in the process of finding the most effective intervention identify the causes of the original problem. It would take years and would be much too expensive if we simply used the traditional two or three experimental groups plus a control group type of design typical of most educational research. Note we are suggesting that design comes first and that carefully built but practical experimental design be created. We can then turn these designs over to researchers and others who have practical experience in carrying out such kinds of activity. Such a strategy allows for a research program that would be focused and coordinated, with studies conducted in a variety of places, but with the desirable quality that it will be possible to interrelate them for maximal usefulness.

CONCLUSION

We have mapped out the general design and have identified some parameters for a comprehensive program of research and development and policy studies.

It is a research and development program that promises large payoffs. Almost anything that can be learned in a program that studies the problems of beginning teachers can be used to improve preservice and inservice programs. We are here concerned with a fundamental problem--how does one learn to become an effective teacher? Obviously, something is lacking in preservice programs. If we can discover what is lacking by studying the problems of beginning teachers, we will have made substantial progress in knowing how to improve the effectiveness of teachers.

Chapter 10

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter we present the major conclusions from the study of beginning teacher programs, particularly the internships and induction programs, and of the problems of beginning teachers. We summarize here the major conclusions and policy and research recommendations which seem to flow from the analyses which we have made.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Perhaps the most important conclusion of this study is that the problems of beginning teachers have not really been thoroughly studied. We know that beginning teachers have serious problems in the transition period from preservice programs into teaching. We have general ideas about what these problems are. But we know very little in terms of the specifics of these problems, how they develop, what factors influence them, and how they interact with each other. Their effects on the beginning teacher's development of competence and effectiveness and sense of efficacy is unknown. We believe the effect is to restrict and constrain the development of the teacher so that they are likely to rely on those teaching practices which helped them to survive their first days of teaching. It may be that some teachers remain at this level of teaching an extended period and perhaps even throughout their professional career.

2. We have concluded that the criterion of the effectiveness of a preservice program is the extent to which its graduates master the transition period efficiently and effectively. We think that preparing teachers for the highest levels of professional competence, while eminently desirable, ought to be secondary to the goals of preparing them for the transition period.

3. We have not found any program which adequately prepares teachers for the transition period so that they do not experience great trauma or anxiety or so that they move through it effectively and efficiently. Programs such as internships move the experience of the transition period into the early days of the internship. Interns, however, seem to experience much the same kinds of anxiety and difficulty which other beginning teachers do; the internship does provide the continuous support which appears to be needed during this transition period.

We have limited experience in this country with induction schemes or programs in which beginning teachers are helped as they begin regular teaching. The best forms of such induction programs seem to provide assistance through a teacher-tutor who both acts as a mentor and monitors the development of the beginning teacher. Programs of this kind have been very successful in Great Britain and some preliminary examples in the United States appear equally promising.

4. These various programs, the internship and the induction program, do not eliminate the problems of the beginning teacher. They assist the beginning teacher during the period of the transition, and it may be that the particular forms of assistance which are provided in each of these programs during the important first days are the critical factor rather than the structure or format of the total program.

5. We are as uninformed about the best solutions for helping teachers with these problems as we are about the nature of the problems themselves. Much more extensive knowledge is needed about the nature of the problems of beginning teachers, their causes, and those components of training which may ameliorate or obviate these problems. Such knowledge

can be obtained only by a comprehensive and directed program of research and development.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. We think that policy studies should be undertaken simultaneously with research and development studies to assess the policy alternatives with respect to how most effectively deal with the problems of beginning teachers.

2. The basic policy decision which has to be made is who will be responsible for this transition period; who will identify and bring together the groups to participate in the policy decisions, recommendations and studies; who will organize the systems for developing programs for beginning teachers?

3. We believe, given the scope and seriousness of the problems of beginning teachers, that the state governments should be primarily responsible for initiating and coordinating the systems which will eventually develop programs for beginning teachers, wherever these programs may be located in the structure of teacher education and whatever form they may take.

4. We think that it is essential that teacher organizations be involved in the development of policies about research on the problems of beginning teachers, policies about the development of programs for beginning teachers, the study of policies with respect to these programs, and even the development and management of the programs. Specifically, we think that teacher organizations and teachers ought to be encouraged to undertake programs for beginning teachers in pilot projects and to participate fully in the evaluation of all such experimental demonstrations.

5. We think, that whatever eventual forms programs for beginning teachers take, teacher organizations and teacher educators ought to play a major role in their development and management.

RESEARCH RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The study which should be given primary importance is the study of the problems of beginning teachers. Samples of cohorts of beginning teachers should be followed using methodologies which will enable the investigators to study these problems in depth. These beginning teachers should be studied from the time they accept a position, and preferably from the time they begin their preservice program, through the transition period and for at least the first year of their teaching careers.

The purpose of these studies should be to identify with precision the nature of the problems of beginning teachers, their causes and their dynamics.

2. We have proposed a series of experimental studies designed to identify the precise causes of the major problems facing beginning teachers. This line of investigation is essential if we are to develop programs which will be effective.

3. We have proposed a series of evaluation studies of components of existing programs. We think that different aspects of certain programs can be studied in depth and compared with other forms in different programs to provide us with more data about what appear to be highly effective arrangements.

4. We believe that a coordinated and systematic program with these three major components could provide sufficient knowledge within three

years to begin the development of pilot demonstrations.

We have urged that teachers, teacher organizations, teacher educators and local administrators participate in the evaluation of the meaning of these studies and advise on their design, so the studies will have practical utility and so that the results of the research will be translated into programs which can be incorporated in the structure of teacher education with the support of the profession as a whole.

References

Bolam, R., Baker, K., & McMahon, A. The Teacher Induction Pilot Schemes (TIPS) project: National evaluation report. Bristol, England: University of Bristol, School of Education, 1979.

Bolam, R., Baker, K., McMahon, A., Davis, J., & McCabe, C. The 1977 national conference on teacher induction. Bristol, England: University of Bristol, School of Education, 1977.

Gaede, O. F. Reality shock: A problem among first-year teachers. Clearing House, 1978, 51, 405-409.

James Report. Teacher education and training. London: HMSO, 1972.

Lortie, D. C. School teacher: A sociological study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.

McDonald, F. J., & Allen, D. W. Training effects of feedback and modeling procedures on teaching performance. Stanford, CA: Stanford University, 1967.

McDonald, F. J., & Elias, P. The effects of teaching performance on pupil learning. In Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study, Phase II, Volume I. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1976.

Plowden Report. Children and their primary schools. A report of the Central Advisory Council for Education. London: HMSO, 1967.

Ryan, K. (Ed.). Don't smile until Christmas: Accounts of the first year of teaching. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Taylor, J. K., & Dale, I. R. A survey of teachers in their first year of service. Bristol, England: University of Bristol, School of Education, 1971.

Tisher, R. (Ed.). The induction of beginning teachers in Australia. Melbourne, Australia: Monash University, 1978.

White Paper. Education: A framework for expansion. Department of Education and Science. London: HMSO, 1972.